

NOV 18 1916

Trenton.

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLVI—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, 1916.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1916

CONTENTS

I. Church History Pure and Applied.....	469
By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
II. Charge to Dr. Abdel Ross Wentz.....	493
By Rev. E. D. Weigle, D.D.	
III. Some Literary Approximations	500
By Isaac R. Pennypacker, Lit.D.	
IV. Radical Change in Carnegie Pension Plan for College Teachers	512
By President William A. Granville, Ph.D., LL.D.	
V. "The Old Testament in the Light of Today.".....	517
By Professor Herbert C. Alleman, D.D.	
VI. The Relation of Faith and Works.....	532
By Rev. G. Albert Getty.	
VII. The Social Program of Leo XIII.....	542
By Rev. O. H. Pannkoke.	
VIII. The Old Testament Religion.—Was It a Revelation or an Evolution?	548
By Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D.	
IX. The Scope of Religious Education.....	565
By Charles William Heathcote, A.M., S.T.D.	
X. Current Theological Thought.....	577
I. In English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
II. In German. By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
XI. Review of Recent Literature.....	593
Works of Martin Luther—Sunday, The World's Rest Day—Basic Ideas in Religion or Apologetic Theism—Encyclopaedia of Re- ligion and Ethics—The Mythology of all Races, Greek and Roman, North America—Religious Rheumatism—The Eisenbach Gospel Selections—Some Counterfeit Religions—Historical Lutheranism —A Fourfold Test of Mormonism—Christ's Humiliation.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER 1916.

ARTICLE I.

CHURCH HISTORY PURE AND APPLIED.*

BY REV. PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

The aim of the Theological Seminary, I understand, is to prepare men to minister the Gospel of Christ. That is its sole purpose and all of its workings must contribute to that end. Of this fact I am not unmindful when I take up the task of teaching Church History in this Seminary. I propose to keep in mind first and last the primary and fundamental purpose of a Theological Seminary, namely, the specific equipment of students for the Gospel Ministry. To that determining purpose the study of Church History must make some essential contribution. This is a very practical consideration.

But there is another thought that insists on making itself felt in this connection. This is an educational institution. It is a Theological Seminary. It is the home of the theological sciences. Now there is such a charm about that word "science" these days that when a person takes up the study or the teaching of a new branch of knowledge he can scarcely avoid looking at it first of all in its abstract scientific aspect. Is Church History a

* An address delivered by Doctor Wentz in the Seminary Chapel, September 21, 1916, on the occasion of his inauguration as Professor of Historical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

science in the true sense of that term? If it is not, it has no place in an educational institution. Is Church History a theological science? If it is not, it has no place in an institution of learning that calls itself a Theological Seminary. But can Church History be presented from the Lutheran point of view and yet remain a science? If it cannot, it can constitute no integral part of the curriculum of a Lutheran Theological Seminary. Such are some of the theoretical considerations that suggest themselves.

These two lines of thought are preliminary to the actual beginning of the work in this department of Historical Theology. The one line has to do with the theoretical aspect of our subject, *Church History as a Theological Science*. The other has to do with the more practical aspect of the subject, *Church History as a Seminary Study*. Let us consider them briefly in their order. For such a discussion, it seems to me, will indicate to you, Mr. President of the Board of Directors, to you my esteemed colleagues of the Faculty, and to you my fellow students,—to you and to the Church whose interests we serve it will indicate in a broad way how I conceive of my mission here and what I hope to accomplish.

First, then,

CHURCH HISTORY AS A THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE.

Its Scientific Character.

Every subject presented in any school of learning should be presented scientifically. That is to say, it should constitute a distinct object of study, a distinct field of investigation; and its content should be made up of knowledge that has been gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking and has been systematized and formulated with reference to the operation of general laws and the discovery of general truths. A well-ordered curriculum today has no more room for superposition than it has for superstition, no more room for fancies than it has for phantoms. Each of its parts must be a science both in its methods and in its content.

Now a theological seminary is an educational institution, a school. No matter whether you regard it as a preparatory school, as a university, as an appendage to the college, as a post-graduate school, as a vocational school, or as a professional school,—it is a school. It deals therefore with sciences, specifically in this case the theological sciences. Among the theological sciences found in the curriculum of all theological seminaries is the subject of Church History. This branch of study must be able, therefore, to assert and maintain both its theological character and its scientific character. Only so is it able to justify its name and its place.

In what sense, then, may Church History be regarded as a theological science and with what grace may it take a place among the other theological sciences? We can perhaps best define Church History as a theological science by differentiating it from another science very familiar to us in its scientific character and very closely related to Church History, namely, General History. General History as a science we know. Its place in a cultural training and its necessity in certain vocational training is uncontested. Like many other sciences it is in theory an exact science but in practice falls far below that and is therefore much more than an exact science. It is comparatively young as a strict science and like most other sciences it is constantly broadening its scope, increasing its content, multiplying its aims, and improving its methods. So that General History is today fully recognized as a science and occupies a place of dignity among the other mental and social sciences.

I have just completed seven years of teaching General History in the College. When now I turn to the teaching of Church History the question naturally forces itself upon me, What is the relation between these two neighbors? The answer to that question will enable us to see both the theological and the scientific character of our subject.

What is the relation between General History and Church History? It would seem to be a very easy answer to the question to say that Church History is simply one

aspect of General History and is related to General History as species to genus, as sub-division to main topic. Now it is true that General History does include the history of the Christian Church; it does embrace within itself the history of religion and the history of religious agencies and ecclesiastical institutions. We no longer distinguish history as "sacred" and "profane." For General History has long since ceased to be a mere narrative of political events, the reigns of kings and the duration of wars, and under the title of *Kulturgeschichte* has come to embrace every sphere of human activity and every field of human interest. It analyzes civilization into all its constituent elements and sets forth the history of each element. It traces the intimate habits of men and the multiform institutions of nations. Not the least of these habits and institutions is religion. And so it is that religion and the Church are thoroughly comprehended in General History today. They are the objects of general historical investigation. But to say for that reason that Church History is only a longitudinal section of General History or the History of Civilization falls short of the truth and is wholly inadequate for our purpose. For such a definition completely robs Church History of its theological character and forever forbids it to stand upon its own feet as a separate and independent science.

No, the solution is not so simple. If Church History consisted merely of certain paragraphs extracted from the pages of General History, then Church History might indeed be a science,—it *might*—but it would certainly not be a theological science and it would be utterly unworthy of the dignified name of Historical Theology. It is possible to present the history of the Christian Church and the history of the Christian Religion without entering the sphere of the theological sciences at all, but such a treatment would be as inadequate as a history of painting by a weaver of canvas or a history of sculpture by a quarrier. Simple justice to the subject demands that Church History preserve its distinctive character as a theological science with all that this entails. And if Church History is to be presented as a theological science, distinct from

the science of General History, there must be a difference not merely in the scope of the material it embraces, not merely in the number of pages covered, but there must be a difference above all in point of view.

But how can we speak of the "point of view" of a subject without forfeiting its scientific character? Must not every real science utterly eliminate every presupposition and every personal equation whatsoever? Does it not conflict with the very idea of genuine science if we start out with any theological assumptions however general and harmless they may seem to be? Are not all modern sciences as impartial in the search for truth as a photographic negative and as blind to the consequences of truth as Justice herself? In theory, yes; in practice, no. We know now that in all observation and experiment and in many inductions it is absolutely impossible to eliminate the personal equation, impossible to avoid a point of view, and practically no science is without its presuppositions.

Certainly the science of History is not without its assumptions and presuppositions. The historian of civilization even with the best of intentions cannot maintain strict objectivity if he performs his full duty to his subject. In the ascertainment of facts, it is true, the purely empirical, the purely objective-critical method is sufficient. And, indeed, that method of investigating the facts is demanded in the interest of modern inductive science. But that is not enough. To determine the facts of history and set them down in the order of their occurrence is not the sole occupation of the historian. Nor is it his most important task. The historian is much more than a mere annalist. To relate occurrences, to describe conditions, to set forth the consecution of events, is only the beginning of the historian's work. If his duties were limited to research and narrative it might indeed be possible in this way to describe history and to narrate history, but it would certainly not be possible by this method alone to *understand* history. Man is much more than the sum of his classifiable operations. Far more important therefore than the ascertaining of the facts is the task of explaining the world-process out of the mass of

historical materials. The chaos of details must be resolved into an orderly whole. The historian must draw perspectives and serve as an interpreter in terms of human reason. By dint of varying emphasis, by the turn of his index finger, he must point out the high places and call attention to symptomatic tendencies. To do this he must pass beyond the simplicity of empirical objectivity and so-called impartiality and must go on to apply standards of judgment to human happenings. He must indicate the trends of events and the trains of consequences and he must form estimates of value.

But as soon as he leaves the narrow sphere of individual facts and casts his view upon the totality of events the historian cannot fail to enter the sphere of the subjective and then it is that his personal "point of view" comes into play. He must make assumptions. The very effort itself to understand the meaning of history as a whole proceeds on the assumption, the metaphysical assumption, that the activities of the human spirit constitute a unity and a continuity down the ages. The effort to comprehend the world-process would be utterly meaningless and futile without that assumption. Modern historical method requires a metaphysics of history which posits a progress of the human race. What the standard of that human progress is depends in each case upon the point of view of the historian and many are the personal factors that thus enter into the telling of the story, many the colors that may be combined in the making of the picture. It cannot be denied, therefore, that the "point of view" is a very important factor in determining the method of procedure and the product of investigation in historical science.

Now the main point of difference between General History and Church History is just here in the general point of view. There is no essential difference in the nature and extent of their materials, for all the facts of universal history concern the Church Historian. Their methods are much the same, for the visible Church is no enchanted ground on which we are exempt from the laws of evidence and common sense and so the Church Histo-

rian must proceed critically. He must decipher his authorities and study their thoughts and feelings in the same way as other historians, and if the Lives of mediaeval saints are no more reliable as sources of truth than the letters of modern diplomats, neither are they any less reliable. The purpose of the two kinds of historians is very similar, for the Church historian, like the political or the constitutional historian or the economic historian who is such a favorite nowadays, must sift out his facts and trace a certain line of growth. In many respects, therefore, the two sciences are not unlike. In scope of materials, in systematic procedure, in critical method, in verifying conclusions by exact observation, and in formulating results with reference to general truths, they are very similar.

But there remains the broad difference in point of view. This is important for our subject. The representative of General History in relating the history of civilization assumes the continuity of the human mind and an orderliness of human nature and he proceeds to set forth the development of the human race and its progress towards its goal of subduing the world and bringing forth an ideal humanity. The Church Historian makes no larger assumption than that. He remains therefore just as strictly within the bounds of pure science as the writer of General History. But the movement which Church History depicts has a different goal from that which General History depicts. For while General History deals with the progress of the human race in realizing its ideals, Church History on the other hand deals with the coming of the Kingdom of God in the Church of Jesus Christ. In General History the individual is regarded as a unit in the organism of mankind; in Church History he is viewed as a unit in the communion of saints. This is the chief distinction between the two sciences. Granted the difference in point of view the scientific character of both goes unchallenged. Church History therefore is a science, an independent science. It is as complete in itself as any other of the social sciences. Its character of independence is not forfeited by its religious

point of view, because that very point of view redeems it from subserviency to the science of General History and assigns to it its own field of investigation.

Its Theological Character.

The theological character of the science of Church History can be explained also by contrast with General History. It grows out of the difference in the assumptions made by the two sciences.

As General History assumes the freedom of human personality so Church History assumes divine revelation. As the natural sciences proceed on the assumption that the physical universe constitutes a closed aggregate of forces and that all physical events are the issue of natural causes immanent somehow in the physical universe, so the science of History proceeds on the assumption that human nature is essentially uniform in the possession of personality and free will and that the actions and interactions of these personal agents constitute a progressive and methodical advance towards a world-goal, and so the science of Church History proceeds on the assumption that the redemptory work of Christ constituted a new beginning in the religious experience of the race and that the spirit of Christ rules in the Christian Church as the motive-power of new life which grows from more to more both in the individual and in the community.

These assumptions are different in kind but they are the same in degree. Belief in the Gospel is no more a prejudice, no more unscientific, than disbelief. As it is impossible to get a real understanding of the history of civilization if we proceed upon mere analogies to physical events, so it is impossible to gain an adequate understanding of the history of the Church if we regard it merely as the natural result of the development of the race. Fundamental and indispensable to our science is the assumption of a supernatural factor, the agency and the product of revelation. Essential to its intelligent treatment is the unshakable conviction of the transcendent importance of the Gospel as the clue to all history.

This means faith. The Church of Christ, its origin, its being, its completion, is an article of faith. And therein lies the theological character of our science. Church History is theology. And so long as theology is not dissolved into the general science of religion, Church History will not be lost on the pages of General History or crowded out by the other social sciences but will remain a theological science secure and independent.

Its Confessional Character.

Now if Church History is theology, the Church Historian must be a theologian. He must be a theologian at least in the sense that he must take a position with reference to the theological problem. The theological sciences as a group are naturally centered in systematic theology, which is the scientific conception and systematic disposition of the given facts in Christianity, the Bible, the Church, and Christian experience. And the attitude of the individual theologian on questions of systematic or dogmatic theology will as a matter of course be an important factor in determining the spirit in which he prosecutes his own science. To this rule Church History is no exception. The doctrinal position of the Church Historian is of tremendous significance both for his investigation and for his presentation of his subject.

This could be abundantly illustrated from the writings of Church Historians whose works are familiar to you. One, like Gieseler, measures everything with the insipid standards of rationalism and never really reaches the spiritual marrow of the Church. The negative effect of this attitude is apparent in spite of his best efforts at impartiality, for he presents nothing but a skeleton of dry bones, cold, lifeless, tedious. Others, like Neander and his disciple Philip Schaff, view the history of the Church as a continuous revelation of Christ's presence and power in humanity. Their accounts reflect the warm glow of their own evangelical piety and they set before us the history of the Christian Church as a living organism, sympathetic, attractive, full of life and heart.

The personal attitude of the workman does have a great deal to do with the product of his labors. A certain predisposition is necessary for the successful treatment of any subject. Men and events may be *described* out of cold knowledge, but neither men nor events can be *understood* without sympathy and imagination. We should hardly expect a discriminating biography of Beethoven from one who has no music in his soul. We should scarcely expect an adequate account of the history of religion from an irreligious or atheistic person. The history of Christianity from the pen of an avowed Buddhist or Mohammedan might be interesting as literature but it would certainly not be satisfying as history. A worthy account of the life of Christ can come only from one who has felt in his own life the grip of Christ's power and is conscious of personal piety towards the subject of his narrative. Likewise the history of the Christian Church can be properly set forth only by one who is in intimate sympathy with the life of the Christian Church, her ideals and her spirit. Even apart from his intellectual assent to the general assumption of a divine revelation the Church Historian must be a live Christian. He must recognize the supernatural factor, the operation of the spirit of Christ, not only in the beginning of the Church but also in her progress down the centuries. This is a positive definite predisposition that the Church Historian cannot dispense with if his subject is to be a theological science.

Then, too, within the broad circle of positive Christianity, doctrinal and ecclesiastical choices are necessary. It is sometimes said that the profession of the Church Historian is the most convenient profession among the theological branches, because it is thought that the writing and teaching of Church History does not call for a decided position on mooted questions of doctrine and practice. In other words, it is argued that the Church Historian has less to do with controversy, is less liable to be afflicted with theological rabies, than other theologians. That sort of argument usually proceeds from persons who are themselves without strong convictions.

But I am inclined to feel that in most cases theological rabies is to be preferred to theological lock-jaw. At any rate, whether it is desirable or not, it is a fact that the specialist in Church History cannot avoid theological presuppositions either in his investigation or in his presentation. The Church Historian who thinks he can by virtue of his specialty clothe himself in the comfortable cloak of pure scientific objectivity deceives himself and the truth is not in him. No, whoever tries to present the history of the Christian Religion, the history of the Church in general, or the history of any Church in particular, must form judgments. He must take positions. His own comfort cannot dictate. Asbestos might indeed be a useful material with which to surround one's self in times of fiery controversy, but asbestos is not a useful material from which to make working clothes. The non-committal asbestine historian may consider himself comfortable by virtue of his aloofness but in his secure indifference he is not properly clothed for the full accomplishment of his whole duty.

The doctrinal position of the Church Historian, his attitude towards the theological problem, is important not merely for the general deductions that he makes from his data, not merely for the conclusions that he draws at the close of his investigations, but it is important at the very beginning and throughout the course of his work. It is of importance not only in determining his definition of his subject which fixes his conception of his task but also in determining the special field of his inquiry. What is the essence of Christianity? And what is the Christian Church? These questions must be answered before the work of the Church Historian can proceed. It is a mistake to suppose that they can be answered in the course of the historical investigation. No, the historian must have a clear idea of his subject before he begins to prosecute it. But no one has ever yet answered these questions about the essence of Christianity and the marks of the Christian Church without thereby indicating his theological position.

The same is true with reference to the great branches

of the Christian Church, Protestantism and Catholicism. Define the essence of each and you disclose your personal attitude towards them. In the face of these two conceptions of Christianity, so fundamentally divergent, it is simply impossible for the Church Historian to maintain complete impartiality. It is greatly to be regretted that this difference in confessional position has so often led not merely to a difference in historical evaluation but even to a difference in questions of the facts themselves. Nevertheless, in view of what has already been said, we Protestants must, I think, recognize the *scientific* right of a history of Christianity from the Catholic point of view. And where such history is prosecuted by strict scientific methods, and not merely for polemical reasons, more is accomplished in the end than can possibly result from the barren, spineless offerings of the historian who is incapable of forming a judgment or is unwilling to express one.

Moreover, even within the various branches of Protestantism, the Church Historian can scarcely avoid the influence of his doctrinal and ecclesiastical position if his work is to be carried on as a theological science. However much the various Protestant confessions may agree among themselves in all the essential articles of faith, the differences among them are not merely speculative and academic but they are of a religious and practical nature. These differences affect the entire circle of theology, interpretation, organization, worship, and practical piety. Differences in dogmatic theology involve differences in all the other sciences of the theological group. The effects of this are felt by the Church Historian in his work, and these effects are evident in the products of his labors.

In the first place, in these days of specialization, the confessional interest of the historian is one of the most important factors in determining the particular field of his detailed research. The hands and the mind naturally busy themselves with the object that lies close to the heart. And this personal interest equips the eye with optical apparatus which enables it to see facts and relations that would remain completely hidden but for the

dogmatic interest. Sharpened vision is not necessarily fancy or prejudice: it is a legitimate instrument for the discovery of truth.

Then, too, the confessional interest of the Church Historian helps to determine his attitude on fundamental problems. The definition he gives of Church and Sacraments, the relative position he assigns to the Person and Work of Christ in the history of doctrines, the emphasis he places upon the work of different individuals, the importance he ascribes to certain events and movements in history, his division of the history of the Church into periods and epochs, and above all his evaluation of general tendencies and his deduction of general truths,—these and many other things will be affected by his confessional position. This is necessarily so and it is not to be deprecated. The impartial historian is not the historian who has no convictions, nor the historian who conceals his convictions by refusing to express opinions, but the historian who has formed his convictions by a single-hearted effort to be true to events by living them over again and to be true to the lives of men by thinking their thoughts after them and by understanding their whole environment. Convictions that have been formed by this impartial method cannot fail to enter into the narrative in terms of sympathy or antipathy. They will of necessity color the narrative. And this can be done with strict pedagogical propriety and without for a moment violating the quality of our subject as a theological science. This is the justification for treating Church History as a theological science, the warrant for teaching Historical Theology from the confessional stand-point. Just that is my commission.

For I am asked today to pledge myself to aid in carrying out the design of this Seminary. That design is stated to be the educating of men for the Christian Ministry and the providing of our Churches with "pastors who sincerely believe the Word of God as contained in the Old and New Testaments to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and who hold the Augsburg Confession to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doc-

trines of the Divine Word." And I am asked to declare for myself that I "believe the Scriptures to be the inspired Word of God" and that I believe "the Augsburg Confession and the Smaller Catechism of Luther to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God," and so to teach. This I do *ex animo*. By birth and by choice, by training and by experience, by native disposition and by reasoned conviction, I confess myself a Lutheran. Otherwise I should not undertake to teach Historical Theology in a Lutheran Theological Seminary. For I realize, as I have indicated, that the confessional position of the teacher, even the teacher of Historical Theology, is not without serious influence upon the results of his labors.

I propose, therefore, to treat the theological science of Church History as an integral part of the curriculum in a Lutheran Theological Seminary and in a way that will be consistent with the well-known theological and confessional position of this institution. Our widest field is the history of religion. Our particular field is the history of the Christian Church, the Church of the divine and living Christ. And our special field of study and interpretation is the Lutheran Church, her genesis, her development, her work.

We turn now to a more practical consideration, namely,

CHURCH HISTORY AS A SEMINARY STUDY.

We are concerned here not about methods but about results. If the purpose of the Seminary is to prepare men for the Gospel Ministry and if every branch of study in the Seminary curriculum must contribute to that purpose, the question may be raised, How does the study of Historical Theology constitute a part of a man's equipment for the preaching and pastoral office and wherein does Church History aid in the cure of souls. Granting that our subject goes beyond the knowledge of bare facts and rises to the loftier sphere of pure science, it yet remains to show that it is also an applied art and has practical value as a Seminary study.

It would be impossible here to indicate all the practical uses of Church History. The immense cultural effect of all historical study can scarcely be over-estimated, but it does not call for consideration here. What a vast storehouse of rich homiletical treasures the history of the Church affords to the preacher, abounding as it does in sermonic material, in eloquent theme, and in pointed illustration, it may be left to the Department of Homiletics to indicate. What a fund of valuable instruction it furnishes the pastor, holding before him as it does the wisdom and the experience of the ages and the example of our fathers who have not labored in vain,—this may be left to the Department of Pastoral Theology to point out. What an effective instrument of doctrinal discipline it places in the hands of the student, expounding as it does the creeds of the Church like the history of a country expounds its constitution and dissolving as it does abstract doctrines in the alembic of concrete life like Christ dissolved his teachings in parables,—this may be left to the Department of Dogmatic Theology to set forth. Suffice it to say here that the main practical value of Church History as a Seminary study has reference to the general spirit which it begets or fosters within the life and heart of the student.

The chief point of usefulness in modern historical study is not to please our fancy, nor to gratify our curiosity, nor to test our memories, nor even to add to our stock of information and provide a fund of convenient precedents, but to help us to understand ourselves and our fellow-men and the problems and prospects of mankind. General History teaches the individual to understand himself as a unit in the organism of humanity, to realize his position as an heir of the ages and as a factor in present-day civilization. So Church History seeks to help the individual to understand himself as a unit in the great Church of Christ, to realize his position as an heir of eternal spiritual values and as a factor in the Kingdom of God. The individual who so understands himself will be very vitally and practically influenced in

his attitude towards men and things. His entire temper and disposition will be affected.

There are many qualities of temperament, many lines of disposition, which the study of Church history tends to cultivate. I have chosen to indicate here only three of them.

First, there is

The Spirit of Loyalty.

Devotion to a righteous cause is always deepened by information about that cause. Zeal must be tempered with knowledge if it is to be healthful. The person whose allegiance to Christ and to the Church is not rooted and grounded in thorough-going knowledge of Christ and the Church, in penetrative understanding of the spirit of Christ as it has manifested itself in the history of the Church,—such a person might be a legalist in his devotion, he could scarcely be regarded as a loyalist. He might do what he is told, breaking no rules but keeping faith with the word that is written and can be read. But there is a devotion that goes much further than that, a devotion that grows out of vital touch with the very spirit and purpose of Christ as it has unfolded itself in the life of the Church through the centuries. This is the kind of devotion that far transcends the mere statute and tradition of Christian living and calls forth service up to the very limit of ability. This is the spirit of loyalty that can be counted on to accomplish the purpose even where the letter fails, the spirit that applies perspective and moulds the means in each case in accordance with the ultimate purpose that is to be served. This spirit, begotten in large measure by the historical sense, calls for qualities of intelligence, alertness, resourcefulness. And this means leadership.

That the history of the Church should be the means of stimulating loyalty to Christ and to the Church is a part of God's own plan. This is evident in His dealings with the Hebrews. Right wondrously Jehovah wrought for Israel, delivering them from friends and foes, leading

them through deep waters, sustaining them on the desert, and providing them with laws and leaders and goodly habitations. And then the covenant of God made provision that the memory of those mighty deeds should never depart from their minds to all generations. To that end it was commanded that the children should always be carefully instructed in the history of those deeds. Memorial pillars were erected. Memorial statutes were enacted. And, above all, memorial feasts were instituted. Thus the wonderful dealings of God became household stories for all time to come. The result was that Israel's literature rang with the note of intense patriotism, and Israel remained a separate people as the depository of true religion and from time to time renewed her devotion to her mission by drinking at the fountain of the memory of her past. God used the pages of history as one of the means to accomplish his purpose with that people.

Now the annals of the Church of Christ are not bare of the marvels of God. God is still in the midst of his people. The Church of the New Dispensation has had her deep waters to cross and her dreadful deserts to pass through. She has had her songs of triumph and she has had an inheritance far fairer than Canaan. She has been saved from her friends and delivered from her foes. She has had her great leaders, she has seen the cloud of fire, and she is about to receive the nations of the earth for her inheritance. If the heart of the Hebrew could thrill with the story of his nation's past and could find in the narrative of that story the source of patriotic zeal, should not the Christian of today find in the grander and more wonderful life-story of his Church the deep springs of a yet more profound loyalty and devotion?

One of the most effectual means employed by the various nations of the earth today in order to inculcate the quality of patriotism in their citizens is the diligent teaching of the nation's history in all the public schools of the land. In times past when the national consciousness has been at a low ebb far-seeing statesmen have inaugurated projects for the diligent study of the national history. This has invariably resulted in a quickening of devotion

to the national interests. Not the smallest factor in forming union sentiment in our own country just before the Civil War was the great interest in the study of our country's history. This interest was at once the cause and the effect of the many worthy narratives of the life of the nation which date from that period.

But history is the mother of ecclesiastical devotion as well as political patriotism. No one can ponder the glorious triumphs of the Cross, the marvelous progress of the Church, the heroic march of her noble army, without taking increased devotion to the great Head of the Church and renewed zeal to her sublime purpose. No one who looks at the Christian Church in the perspective of the ages can dissolve his loyalty or bow his head in discouragement because of the conflagration that is now raging among the Christian nations of Europe, for he knows that the Church has survived horrors far more direful than that and he has the confident assurance that the gates of Mars shall not prevail against her. Christ will triumph. The history of the Church is the unfolding of his purpose. And in an age of increasing indifference of spirit towards the Church we cannot afford to neglect this very potent influence for the arousing of Church loyalty.

What is true of the Christian Church at large is true of the Lutheran Church in particular. Ours is indeed a goodly heritage as a Church and we cannot afford to ignore it. We have a past of which we may well be proud, an honorable past replete with saving principles and associated with cherished memories of godly and heroic fathers. A deepening interest in the history of our Church always means an increase in loyalty to the Church. That is a matter of experience. More than once men have been recovered from un-Lutheran views and healed of un-Lutheran attitudes simply by studying the history of the venerable Church to which they belong. And this applies to the communion as well as to the individual. Ours is pre-eminently a historical Church. It is impossible to catch the spirit of our confession or to appreciate our heritage, impossible to understand the real

genius of our Church, except by a sympathetic knowledge of her history.

What we need, therefore, is that our Lutheran Church in all her parts may experience a vigorous development of her own historic life. With the recovery of the historical sense our Church would begin to assert herself more boldly as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America and would become more conscious of a special mission of her own in our present day. A clearer knowledge of our past in its bearing upon the present, and the conscious effort to preserve the historic landmarks as a distinctive Lutheranism, would mean a revival of Church loyalty, an increased denominational zeal, and a renewed activity in all the practical tasks of Christian love.

It is clear, then, that Church History as a Seminary study cultivates a healthful, chastened spirit of loyalty. And what can be a greater practical asset to a minister of the Gospel than wholesome loyalty and intelligent enthusiasm for Christ, for the Bible, and for his Church?

Then, too, there is

The Spirit of Conservatism.

A proper historical perspective begets a healthful spirit of conservatism. And here it must be emphasized that there is a true and a false spirit of conservatism. There is a spirit of conservatism which means reaction and stagnation and isolation. This is the spirit that has produced the Romish and the Greek types of the Church. Then there is a spirit of conservatism which does not exclude progress but which opposes itself to revolution and radicalism and which seeks simply to secure the present by being true to the results of the past. This is the true spirit of conservatism and it is characterized by a due reverence for history, by moderation of manner, patience of spirit and sobriety of tone. For the precipitance of revolution it substitutes the sober judgment of reformation. For the violence of radicalism it prefers the sober means of steady progressiveness. It does not venerate

the old merely for its antiquity, nor does it reject the new merely for its novelty, but it proves all things and holds fast that which is good.

Just this is the spirit that is begotten by a discriminating study of Church History, the spirit of probity and steadiness. The history of Christianity moves under the influence of that spirit. The world moves slowly but steadily. The Church of Christ moves slowly but steadily. The whole science of history warns against revolution both of theory and of practice. Sudden, swift changes, quick movements in history, are dangerous and are unlikely to produce lasting wholesome effects. True, it sometimes occurs that an abrupt change takes place in a single institution or in a single individual or in a single habit of an individual. But an abrupt general change is unknown to history. There are rare cases in which an individual, through accident or through sudden change of environment or through affliction of terrible disease, is fundamentally transformed in a short lapse of time. But these cases are most exceptional. For there is a tenacious continuity of personality and if all the habits and interests of the individual are examined it will be found that very rarely are any great number of them altered suddenly. Now society is far more conservative even than the individual, for reasons that are obvious. The complexity of human affairs has brought it about that the history of every constructive forward movement in society is the history of slow growth. Real, permanent progress comes only gradually, by almost insensible gradations. As nature abhors a vacuum, and as life abhors a leap, so history seems to abhor cataclysmic transformations. History knows no isolated great events. The Reformation was "due" when it arrived. The French Revolution had long been preparing when it took place. Even such an individual and apparently independent event as the discovery of America cannot be regarded as isolated or absolute.

Likewise, the religious and ecclesiastical situation at any particular time is the outgrowth of past events plus present personalities, and it cannot be correctly under-

stood or properly dealt with apart from the light of the past. I do not mean to say that we can always apply past experience to the complete solution of current problems. That would be as unwise as to view our present problems with obsolete emotions or to attempt their solution with obsolete reasoning. But I do mean to say that the *foundations* of right conduct are always the same and that the spirit of conservatism, or historical-mindedness, is the only guarantee of rational progress. One foundation has been laid from eternity and realized in history, and better foundation than this can no man lay. If the temple of Christian living is to be made more pure and beautiful than it has been hitherto, the wood and the hay and the stubble must be removed, but the gold and the silver and the precious stones of the former structure must be retained, and the new edifice must be erected upon the same old foundation which has survived all the storms of the past and has remained constant through the ages.

As for each one of us, our memory makes the experiences of our lives cumulative and fills us with a desire to conserve the good things of yesterday so that we do not need to begin life over again with each succeeding moment of time, so the historical sense makes us the heirs of a venerable past and fills us with a spirit of conservatism so that we do not need to drag out our lives on the stationary frontiers of Christian grace as though the saints had never lived but conserving our spiritual heritage may use it to equip ourselves for new conquests. This is a very real factor in the practical temperamental equipment of preacher and pastor.

Finally, there is

The Spirit of Progressiveness.

The prospect to the future is in practice even more important than the retrospect of the past. Hope is a stronger enchantress of the heart than memory is. Now the soul of history is the spirit of progress, and this is of the very essence of hope.

Nothing is more conspicuous about modern historical

treatises than the doctrine of the continuity of history. It is this doctrine that distinguishes history as a science from history as mere literature. Time was, little more than half a century ago, when the historian labored chiefly to find out exactly how things had been. There was no effort to determine how things had come about. The motive of the historian was mainly literary or moral and his object was to entertain, edify or comfort the reader. Such was history before the middle of the nineteenth century.

Today the main interest in historical study is the genetical interest. And the great task of the historian is not merely to describe what once was but to show how it came to be. Modern civilization is very complex and in order to understand ourselves in relation to our times we need to know the source of each element in our civilization, where and how it entered the stream of history, and how it combined with other elements. The modern man has a lively consciousness of the reality and the inevitability of change and he is filled with a desire to know the whence and the whither of events.

Now it is an observed fact that every institution of man, every useful idea, every important event, is but the outgrowth of a long line of progress, extending back as far as we care to trace it. This observation has begotten the doctrine of the continuity of history and this in turn has raised history to the dignity of a science. The developmental treatment has come to be the accepted one in nearly all the sciences. In the science of history this means that the present stage of human development must in each case be viewed as a cross-section in the organic process of man's constant advance. The lines of progress lead not merely from past to present but from the past through the present to the future. Thus the scientific study of history turns the face of the student towards the wide expanse of the days that lie before.

This idea of the unity and the continuity of history begets an exhilarating spirit of progressiveness. The world may move slowly, nevertheless it *does* move. Changes for the better may be very gradual in their pro-

cess, nevertheless such changes are constantly taking place. And the reformer of today does not seek his sanction in the past but in the future. He attacks existing evils not by pointing to "the good old times" but by pointing to the vast possibilities of human progress. And these possibilities who can measure? The process of the creation of the world is still going on. The human race is still in its infancy. The Christian Church has only begun her career. And ours is a tremendous responsibility to move forward. The so-called modern world possesses a tremendous wealth of knowledge, the heritage of the ages, and a wide experience of its own. But all this must be regarded only as a vantage ground from which to start into the future with its limitless tasks and possibilities. It is not true that history repeats itself. There may be constantly recurring cycles of formation, deformation, reformation, but the general trend of the cycles themselves is forward and each synthesis is a new thesis. Each age is clearly conscious of original tasks belonging to itself alone. We are the heirs of a great historical whole to which we must make some contribution. This thought stimulates energy and begets a sense of responsibility.

Now just as General History is the progressive development of the idea of humanity, so the history of the Church is the progressive development of the idea of Christianity. God's work is progressive not only in the development of humanity in general but also in the origin and growth of his special Kingdom. Revelation has been gradual and progressive, because it has been constantly adapted to the capacity of man. From the beginning God has been working an ever widening work, and through the ages there runs a single increasing purpose. That purpose began with the foundation of the world, it came into human view in the centuries of Israel's history, it centered in the life and death of Christ, it entered upon a new stage at Pentecost, and until this very moment it has been constantly increasing and unfolding.

The forward movement of the Church of Christ has never ceased despite its obstructions and retrogressions.

She still moves on to cover the earth and to pervade, transform, and sanctify humanity. As the individual Christian is moving forward in an unceasing process of sanctification, in a progressive understanding and application of the Gospel to his own heart, so the Church of Christ moves ever onward and upward to the supreme climax of a world-wide Gospel and a world-wide sway of Christ the King. To see this progressive movement with clear vision and to realize one's personal responsibility as a unit in the expanding organism of the Church and in the increasing purpose of God,—this is one of the most wholesome practical results that can be hoped for from the study of Church History. For it entails all the good qualities of life and temperament that are bound up with an enlightened spirit of hopefulness and progressiveness.

The spirit of Christian progressiveness is the necessary balance to the spirit of conservatism. Without this spirit of progressiveness the spirit of conservatism would mean paralysis and stagnation. It would mean reaction rather than advance. The two qualities of temperament complement each other and both are essential to the genuine success of preacher and pastor. In the Lutheran Church a progressive conservatism means a wholesome spirit of aggression and an ever increasing vigor of life, a life that avoids what is partisan and feverish on the one hand but on the other hand avoids fossilization and degeneration by sloughing off mere dead traditions and antiquated methods and by making a vigorous enlightened application of our own ecclesiastical heritage to the special tasks to today.

ARTICLE II.

CHARGE TO DR. ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.¹

BY REV. E. D. WEIGLE, D.D.

By virtue of my office as president of the Board of Directors, I have the honor of speaking the message to you denominated a charge. You, my brother, come to this service, in our beloved Seminary, in the enthusiasm and energy of youth, with well trained powers, with an experience of years in somewhat similar work in our College. You take up the work in response to the unanimous choice of its Board of Directors, and at a time when the opportunity is most favorable for telling work in your department. In response to the call of the hour, especial emphasis being laid upon historical studies these days, the resignation of Prof. Kuhlman, for thirteen years the incumbent of the chair of Biblical Theology opening the way for a readjustment of the Seminary curriculum, the chair of Historical Theology, in a distinctive sense, was created. This was done in the interest of harmonious arrangement of the various departments of study, and that the important branches of Church History, History of Doctrine, Missions, History of Religion might receive the attention due them. By thus rearranging and co-ordinating the work of your chair, the other departments become more harmonious and enjoy unity of endeavor. The work of the chair of Biblical Theology, never clearly defined, was distributed, as harmony of studies suggested and permitted.

The various departments of Church History have not merely an external and mechanical, but an organic relation to each other, and form one living whole. This relation the historian must show and the teacher of history

¹ Delivered as President of the Board of Directors of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., on the occasion of the inauguration of Rev. Abdel Ross Wentz. Ph. D., as Professor of Historical Theology, September 21st, 1916

should emphasize. The study of history, both sacred and secular, has assumed new or, at least, added importance in recent years. It has become an essential, in the sphere of broadest scholarship, that history in its most comprehensive sense, be known and applied as a test of what is thought, professed and taught. If this be not done, much of claimed history will impose itself upon us. True history reveals God working mainly through consecrated personality, highly cultured genius, in the power of truth, spirit-quickened. In the history of the Church we have no absentee Christ, even if He is enthroned above the skies, for He ascended and took His throne that He might fill all things. As the great head of the Church He is making history from His throne in the agency of the spirit, in and through, the truth adown the centuries through the instrumentality of His body, the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth. It is a great thing to be set for the defense of the truth, as an instructor of those who are looking forward to the ministry of reconciliation. In a humble way it will be your privilege to magnify your office and your high calling.

Touching the essentials of success in your work we may remark that it will be necessary for you to know yourself in your capabilities, attainments, and limitations as well. It will be highly important to know your pupils in order that you may deal with them justly, and individually and with regard to their varied capabilities, attainments and limitations. It will be absolutely essential for you to know the subject or subjects you are to teach. This will challenge constant and unremitting study, fidelity in imparting and drawing out, in order to keenest and purest mental discipline. It will, doubtless be your constant aim to so meet the demands of the task set you as to call forth the best that is in you; to encourage your students to the best possible in application, research, and persistent study in the mastery of things; to enthuse them in a way that the mastery of the subject in hand will fascinate and charm to the utmost endeavor and progress; to so instruct by the most improved methods, and move and marshall all the powers of thought, that the result will be students

on the road to broadest scholarship and intensest service. Rightly to know your relationship to those under your care, will reveal a responsibility which will oppress you, and an exaltation which will, at times, bewilder you. It is a most responsible thing to be a sharer with others, as co-laborers with God, in preparing young men to become ambassadors for Christ in making known the salvation of God to a perishing world. It is, also, a privilege which outvies that of angels for whilst they minister to the heirs of salvation, the redeemed, in co-operation with God, mediate, in a secondary, representative way the salvation of God itself to willing, trusting hearts even unto the ends of the earth. Who can estimate the work accomplished by this school of the prophets, by the more than eleven hundred men sent forth from within its walls into the Church and the world, the well-trained, safely guided and duly accredited ambassadors of the King whose conquering reign of years and truth shall encompass the world? It is a great thing to be an ambassador of such a King and of such a far-reaching kingdom. To the task of training such ambassadors in the history of the kingdom, you have been called. This is a work into which angels desire to look, but which has been delegated to men to do.

Touching the method of instruction it should be remarked that whilst there is no substitute for the catechetical, in the teaching of most subjects the combination of the lecture method with the catechetical brings the best results. The lecture method only, where the pupil is allowed to be wholly passive, cannot produce the best results. The instructor may lecture ever so well under this filling in process, but the pupil suffers, as he is neither required to study, or be mentally active, in the class-room. A relationship of friendship and unselfish interest is assumed in teacher and thought.

As to the subject matter of your chair, a most inviting field is afforded you for the most assiduous and comprehensive study, and the broadest and safest guidance of those under your care, along the pathways of sanest scholarship. Aristotle termed the highest branch of philosophy, theological. Old Testament Theology has to do with the unfolding of God's gracious purpose in a progressive

revelation in which the cross is indicated in type, shadow and ceremony, until the fulness of the times brings into the joy of realization the new and better covenant in the fact of Jesus Christ, unveiled. Exegetical and Historical Theology furnish the material for Systematic Theology in which clear definition and thorough systematization dominate. Practical Theology directs the use of all theological truth for the conversion of men and their present and eternal salvation. It seeks the right and best application of truth to all the ends for which Christianity has been divinely established in the world. Historical Theology traces the historical development of Christianity in the thought and life of the Church. It takes account especially of God in history. We believe that the changes in the curriculum that have made Historical Theology a separate and undistracted department, along with the readjustment of all departments will mark an epoch in the inner history of our Seminary.

A true education will aim to cultivate in young and old the historical and social imagination. Effort should be put forth to develop in every mind under your direction some appreciation of the past, with its great figures, its story, its song, its struggles, its victories, its mistakes and failures with the hope of projecting into the future a vision of purpose and responsibilities of what is to be realized. This will give hopeful meaning to life, mission and destiny. It will greatly enrich and broaden, as well as deepen, the life of each individual thus trained. In charging you, as president of the Board which has called you to this service, I assume that

1. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to the vow you will take, as an instructor in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod.

The declaration to which you subscribe today, and which is repeated every five years by each professor, indicates how sacredly the fathers have guarded the teaching in this Seminary. There is no desire, or disposition, on the part of any member of the Board, so far as we know, to have the standard of the time-honored orthodoxy lowered to meet the liberalistic teaching tolerated in some

quarters. You, my brother, will be expected to adhere to the line in defending and maintaining the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrine of that Word.

I assume that

2. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to the teachings and cultus of the Lutheran Church of the General Synod.

By this I do not mean that you should teach a Lutheranism which loses sight of the essential oneness of the Lutheran Church, in doctrine, faith and worship, throughout the world, but that you should evermore emphasize the ecumenical character of the Lutheran Church as believed in by the General Synod, the magna charta of whose doctrines, faith and liberties is the venerable and highly-honored Augsburg Confession, as over against any particularistic type of Lutheranism which would array pulpit against pulpit and altar against altar in the same household of faith simply because some matters not essential are lifted into the domain of that which demands credal acceptance and authority. I congratulate you on your coming into this service at the time which is upon us. Your term of service, which we hope may be many years, beginning on the eve of the quadro-centennial of Lutheranism, gives you an opportunity to anchor yourself, if possible, more fully in the evangelic history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, a knowledge of whose return to the simplicity of apostolic Christianity, in bringing an erring Church to the joy of a restored faith, which to a great degree had been lost, is of such supreme importance. The time is ripe for clear and fearless apologetics, grounded on the redemptive purpose revealed by an infallible Bible and the unqualified acceptance of the apostolic watchword so nobly placed into the clearest light by our immortal Luther: "The just shall live by faith." A bold stand on the christocentric history of Reformation times, is what is called for on the part of our Seminaries, our pulpits and our people. Our Lutheran Church, as no other, must save the day in these perilous times, theologically, and historically.

I assume that

3. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to the demands of the teaching from the stand-point, not of a negative, destructive, but a positive, constructive, character.

The growth of the Church in the knowledge of the infallible Word of God, is a constant struggle against error, disbelief and unbelief; hence the history of heresies is an essential part of the history of doctrine. The work of the Church of Jesus Christ is to construct, to restore, to build up. As the Master Himself said, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." It is the province of Church History to aid in promoting a correct knowledge of God's kingdom on earth, and in setting forth its history as a book of life, a store-house of wisdom and piety, and the surest test of His own promise to His people: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The fact that we are living in a stirring, restless, rushing age of discovery, criticism and reconstruction makes it supremely important that the divine-human basis of the whole structure of history as revealed in the apostolic period, or the ever-living fountain of the unbroken stream of the Church, be known and studied in relation to what *must ever remain* the content of a sane and saving system of truth in the best system of evangelic thought. To strengthen the faith in the immovable historical foundations of Christianity and its victory over the world should be the highest ambition of those who are set for the defense of the truth. The claims of the cults, isms and eccentric, negative teachings, viewed in the light of the thought of the centuries, as recorded and expressed by the faithful, impartial and just historian will not stand the test. As a rule these strange teachings which purport to be new are discovered to be as old as the ages—old heresies dug up and re-asserting themselves, whereas they have been met time and again and were many times buried. "The Gospel," says John William Miller, summing up the final result of his life-long studies in history, "is the fulfillment of all hopes, the perfection

of all philosophy, the interpreter of all resolutions, the key of all seeming contradictions of the physical and moral worlds; it is life—it is immortality."

I assume finally that

4. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to salvation by the grace of God in Christ Jesus and through faith, whose justifying power is the article of a standing or a falling Church.

You will not teach self-salvation, nor salvation by character, nor salvation by the good will you entertain toward your fellowmen. The Biblical way of salvation, and that of evangelical history is, first to be saved by grace through faith, then from the power of the new creation in the heart, love and good will shall flow out from such a soul, spontaneously and gladly toward all one's fellow-beings. Love to God supreme, a sweet experience, love of fellowman as self will be a great reality. Then follow good works, the fruit of the Spirit, as naturally as good lungs breathe and a healthy heart beats. You will not explain and reconstruct history to suit the too prevalent rationalism of today. History truly taught becomes a means to grace. If God in history is a reality it may be thus taught. It is not only designed to keep us from discouraging pessimism, but is calculated to give us a sustained hope. In the light of ecclesiastical history our faith should be enthusiastic and world-overcoming, assured that whatever may take place throughout the centuries of time, at last God and his plan to save the world will be fully vindicated.

We trust you may find the work of your department congenial. The privilege of having a share in training an efficient and adequate ministry to supply the needs of our growing Church is something to be coveted. We bespeak for you many years of service in our beloved Seminary. Almost a century of blessed, self-sacrificing service of those gone to their reward, as well as the goodly fellowship into which you today come, are, at once, an incentive and an inspiration to you. You will now take the required obligation, and pronounce your inaugural address.

ARTICLE III.

SOME LITERARY APPROXIMATIONS.¹

BY ISAAC R. PENNYPACKER, LIT.D.

If we except constructive critics like Taine, literary criticism in the main bears a certain resemblance to Pennsylvania politics, in that it is often an effort to pull down from their pedestals one set of personages in order to make room for another set. It is the old struggle of those who are on the outside to force their way in—a struggle not confined to any one walk of life. In Porto Rico, under the Spanish regime, even the bones of the dead were cast from the hillside graves to make room for new occupants.

Within a year or two one of our modern destructive critics, unappreciative of richness, clearness and definiteness of thought, unexcelled power of observation, a condensation and swiftness of narrative that have seldom been equalled and mastery of the poetic art, has called Tennyson "a minor poet." Another writer has pronounced Longfellow "a dreaming German student." A recent article in a magazine given to the discussion of books, lately cast upon the scrap heap Thackeray's poem, "The Church Porch," and pronounced to be banal Tennyson's lines,

—“The little port
Had seldom seen a costlier funeral.”

When Bernard Shaw in his play, "Caesar and Cleopatra," transports those personages to our time, instead of taking back his readers to their time, and Howells and Mark Twain uncork the vials of literary wrath upon Walter Scott's novels, we see the same instinct at work, the same aggressive assertion of the present at the ex-

¹. Address at Commencement exercises of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, June 7, 1916, when the Degree of Doctor of Literature was conferred upon Mr. Pennypacker,

pense of the past. Thousands of years ago it was scornfully said:

"No doubt, but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you."

How soon the present glides into the past! Each generation in turn thinks lightly of the one preceding it. How will the next generation estimate the literature, the soft ideals, the practices of this? Will it look upon the legalized sale of war munitions by the people of a nation at peace to foreign nations at war, as we now look backward upon the once universally legalized human slavery?

That was wise advice, which recommended the daily hearing of some good music, the daily looking at a good picture, the daily reading of a good poem. Let us assume that it is too early in the morning for you to have read the poem, and let us consider for a few moments those familiar lines by Thackeray which "The Bookman" writer disposed of in so summary a fashion. Pendennis had gone up to London to open that tough oyster shell, which the world offers to most young men. At the university and in his love affairs, he had not so far covered himself with glory. There came to him an opportunity to earn some much needed money by doing a piece of literary hack work, the writing of some verses to accompany an engraving already provided for one of those old fashioned Annuals. So Pen shut himself in, and went to work with this result, for which the publisher was induced to pay a good round sum, not because he cared for the verses, but because he was persuaded that the author was a person of social importance:

AT THE CHURCH PORCH.

Although I enter not
Yet round about the spot
 Ofttimes I hover;
And near the sacred gate,
With longing eyes I wait,
 Expectant of her.

The Minster bell tolls out
Above the City's rout
 And noise and humming:
They've hushed the Minster bell:
The organ 'gins to swell:
 She's coming, she's coming!

My lady comes at last,
Timid, and stepping fast
 And hastening hither,
With modest eyes downcast;
She comes—she's here—she's past!
 May heaven go with her!

Kneel undisturbed, fair Saint!
Pour out your praise or plaint
 Meekly and duly;
I will not enter there,
To sully your pure prayer
 With thoughts unruly.

But suffer me to pace
Round the forbidden place,
 Lingering a minute,
Like outcast spirits who wait
And see, through heaven's gate,
 Angels within it.

The critic who found little or no merit in that poem was a woman. From this criticism, from the long list of delicate love songs in English poetry paying tribute to woman, from the comparatively few corresponding poems written by women and from the often expressed belief, shared by a number of men, that the feminine mind to a greater extent than the masculine mind, is direct and practical, and less given than the other to looking in diverse directions, the question arises whether this poem written by a man, and other similar poems from the time of Shakespeare, Waller, Herrick and Lovelace to the period of our own Pinkney and Aldrich, have their appeal

more to men than to women, in spite of the direction in which the compliment takes wing.

Customs and habits of thought have changed much since the poem by Pendennis was written to order as a pot boiler. At that time in America, the present day athletic sports, tennis, baseball, golf, polo, were unknown. Young men with that reverence for womankind, which it is to be hoped, will never die out in wholesome young manhood, then waited at church doors on Sunday mornings throughout this land, just as the poem portrays the young man waiting at the English church porch. To-day there has been substituted the luncheon at the Bellevue-Stratford, the moving pictures, the Sunday golf and tennis. Everywhere an age of intenser work and of intenser pursuit of amusement has been substituted for the simpler ways. The change, however, need not blind us to the human nature manifested in other times, even though the manifestation of the same unchanging power of the lode-star be by different methods. We do not think of estimating George Washington by his unfamiliarity with steam or Abraham Lincoln by the circumstance that he never saw a trolley car or automobile or heard a telephone message. The impulse, taste, mind, whatever it may be called, bent exclusively on being up to date, which regards the past as something no longer to be considered, may easily fail in comprehension of Thackeray's poem. To the nature without capacity for reverence, it will have as little significance as it had to the destructive critic whose words have been quoted.

To pronounce the concluding lines of "Enoch Arden,"
— "The little port

Had seldom seen a costlier funeral."

a mere banality is to show a similar lack of mental expansiveness, because the judgment is the result of an appraisement of a past custom by the taste of the present. The best military critics have a sounder method. They do not study battles and campaigns in the light which history throws upon military movements. If Meade and Lee in July, 1863, had known all that is now known about the battle of Gettysburg, they would have known what

army commanders never know, not even in the day of aeroplanes and wireless messages. Military movements are therefore considered under such light as the army commander had at the time, or as a competent commander he should have had.

In one of Holland's great art galleries there is an impressive painting of the funeral of a Count of Flanders, which evinces to the spectator with indescribable power and solemnity the worldly place of him in whose honor occur these impressive ceremonies, this stately procession of imposing figures, these religious rites. The art of the Victorian poet is no more at fault than the art of the Dutch painter. Literary judgments, like most estimates of human work, are but approximations of the truth, and reflecting the likings of their period, are perpetually undergoing modification. Matthew Arnold's critical papers are replete with controversy—in large measure a modification of previous estimates. As all can raise the flower when all have got the seed, the unusual and new become the commonplace until disuse and forgetfulness again pave the way for rediscovery of the former freshness and attraction. Readers not much past middle life remember the Byron vogue, its decay and his reinstatement; the variations of the Wordsworthian barometer, the slow rise of Tennyson, whom Poe declared to be the greatest poet that ever lived, and the one time unquestioned position of our own Longfellow and Whittier, each working a theretofore undiscovered vein of pure ore. As there are lovers who are eager in pursuit until possession diminishes ardor, so does the world weary of the thought which has ceased to be unfamiliar. Even tales of the North Pole become Bromidean. The present day attitude of superiority towards the poetry of Tennyson and Longfellow is shared by a considerable number of persons who have not read their poems. One such critic, on being asked lately if he had read Longfellow's sonnets, admitted that he had not and subsequently expressed surprise at the rare quality of their artistry.

According to the epidemic of literary opinion which has prevailed now for a half score of years or more, it is un-

fortunate for a poet to possess thought and substance or to be clear and definite in expression. The era of the desultory mind in literature, as in painting and in politics, is too much with us. To be vague is to avoid attack by the submarines of the human mind, which, lying in wait in the deep waters of suspicion, prey upon the evidences of thrift, energy and thought, in either material or immaterial things. In the domain of modern literature it has been only the fruit rotten at the core that has been deemed worthy of marketing by the barrel, and if we may judge from the exclamations of approval, a sated mental palate has for some years taken to this diet with as keen a relish as the Eskimo takes to spoiled fish.

A recent History of American Literature Since 1870 by a Professor in a Pennsylvania College reflects throughout the present day exaggeration of the social sense at the expense of perspective and power and beauty, and that natural leadership which in spite of many experiments the world cannot do without.

It may serve to illustrate this thought by contrasting what Professor Pattee, an exponent of the exaggeration of the social sense, has to say of Thomas Buchanan Read, a Pennsylvania poet, and what certain famous Englishmen said of him. Inasmuch as large numbers of Americans accept placidly England's asserted authority and control over the oceans of the world, perhaps along with her dicta in matters of world-wide importance her judgment in the narrower field of American poetry may be acceptable. Of Bayard Taylor, George H. Boker and Thomas Buchanan Read, Professor Pattee declares, "it was theirs to strike the last notes, ineffective and all too often decadent, of that mid-century music that had begun with Bryant and Poe, with Emerson and Whittier, with Willis and Longfellow. They deliberately neglected the opportunity of reacting upon the actual, civic life of their own land within their own and later times."

Contemporary English judgments presented a radically different opinion. Thackeray said of Read's poem, "The Passing of the Iceberg," that he esteemed it as among the first of modern ballads. Walter Savage Landor wrote of

Read's "Midnight," "America steals a march on us." Dante Gabriel Rossetti sent to Philadelphia for all the lyrics written by Read that he could obtain. Leigh Hunt, who narrowly escaped being a Pennsylvania poet by his father's return from Philadelphia, where he had dwelt for a time, to his old home in England, published an article in the "North British Review," in which he declared Read's "The Closing Scene" to be unquestionably the best American poem he had met with, and with one or two exceptions the only American poem he could read over and over again. "It is," he wrote, "an addition to the permanent stock of poetry in the English language. . . . It merits the fame which Gray's 'Elegy' has obtained without deserving it nearly so well."

That master of words and their uses, Abraham Lincoln, whose tenacious memory held in store entire cantos from Byron's poems, carried Read's "The Oath" about with him, and asked James E. Murdock to read it a second time in the Senate chamber at Washington, making Hannibal Hamlin, Vice-President of the United States, bearer of the request. It may be doubted whether any similar use will be made of our modern poetry about "The Hired Man" from North of Boston, or whether Masefield's widows or heroes from the underworld will serve any similar nation-wide purpose or react to the same extent upon the civic life of their author's time. In fact the present "British Review" said a few months ago that dealing with sterner matters, English readers now demanded a more virile literature than the Arnold Bennetts and John Galsworthys could supply, and had rejected the modern product for the work of earlier authors, whom present day iconoclasts have been striving to displace. An article in the "English Poetry Review" for June of this year, says that "Prior to August, 1914, there was much applause for the sordid realism of Mr. Masefield's gloomier muse. To-day the impulse is toward a whiter flame, and we have passed from murkiness into light." Already, therefore, in Europe, that present, which Professor Pattee's History of modern American literature sets forth, has begun to glide into the past, taking with it

recent fancies, fashions, tastes and standards. On this side of the Atlantic a temporary and fading fashion still lingers, but we may be sure that at least the colonial mind of America will in due time change its preference and taste in literature, when it fully understands that the sanction to change has been given.

Let us turn for a few moments from the external estimates, already quoted in regard to Thomas Buchanan Read's work to the work itself. Instead of failing to reach the actual civic life of his own land in his own time, his American epic, "The New Pastoral," portrays the life of the miller, the wagoner, the mason, the boatman, the country folk of America and the migration to the West of a body of Pennsylvanians. The introduction is dated in the year 1854. Six years earlier Chicago had acquired its first ten miles of railroad. Four years earlier the town's population was less than 30,000. In 1854 no railroad across the continent had been built. The year of the poem was the year of Abraham Lincoln's first debate with Stephen A. Douglass, but the poet then living in Italy, probably had heard little of Lincoln. Read's prophecy, embraced in lines towards the conclusion of "The New Pastoral," a prophecy which foretells the rise of the great city on the lake, the coming of continental railroads and the work of Abraham Lincoln, appears one of the most extraordinary visions of the future occurring in any literature.

The poem opens happily:

Fair Pennsylvania!.....

.....I have seen
In lands less free, less fair, but far more known,
The streams which flow through history, and wash
The legendary shores—and cleave in twain
Old capitals and towns, dividing oft
Great empires and estates of petty kings
And princes, whose domains full many a field,
Rustling with maize along our native West,
Out measures and might put to shame! and yet
Nor Rhine inebriate reeling through his hills,

Nor mighty Danube, marred with tyranny,
Its dull waves moaning on Hungarian shores—
Nor rapid Po, his opaque waters pouring
Athwart the fairest, fruitfullest and worst
Enslaved of European lands—nor Seine,
Winding uncertain through inconstant France—
Is half so fair as thy broad stream whose breast
Is gemmed with many isles, and whose proud name
Shall yet become among the names of rivers
A synonym of beauty—Susquehanna!

After many pages, when the pilgrims have reached the West, their long journey by wagon and boat, through forest and flood and over prairie completed, at last there comes the remarkable prophecy:

“Afar the woods before the vision fly—
Swift as a shadow o'er the meadow grass
Chased by the sunshine—and a realm of farms
O'er spreads the country wide; where many a spire
Springs in the valleys, and on distant hills,—
The watch towers of the land. Here quiet herds
Shall crop the ample pasture, and on slopes
Doze through the summer noon, while every beast
Which prowls, a terror to the frontier fold,
Shall only live in some remembered tale,
Told by Tradition in the lighted hall,
When the red grate usurps the wooded hearth,
Here shall the City spread its noisy streets,
And groaning steamers chafe along the wharves;
While hourly o'er the plain, with streaming plume,
Like a swift herald bringing news of peace,
The rattling train shall fly; and from the East—
E'en from the Atlantic to the new found shores
Where far Pacific rolls, in storm or rest,
Washing his sands of gold—the arrowy track
Shall stretch its iron bond through all the land,
Then these interior plains shall be as they
Which hear the ocean roar, and northern lakes
Shall bear their produce, and return them wealth;
And Mississippi, father of the floods,
Perform their errands to the Mexic gulf,

And send them back the tropic bales and fruits.
Then shall the generations musing here,
Dream of the troubrous days before their time:
And antiquaries point the very spot
Where rose the first rude cabin and the space
Where stood the forest-chapel with its graves,
And where the earliest marriage rites were said,
Here in the middle of the nation's arms,
Perchance the mightiest inland mart shall spring;
Here the great statesman from the ranks of toil
May rise, with judgment clear, as strong as wise;
And with a well directed patriot blow,
Reclinch the rivets in our union bands,
Which tinkering knaves have striven to set ajar!"

These three Pennsylvania poets, Read, Taylor and Boker, lived in more stirring times than America has since known. They were all men of action as well as poets, in this respect differing from the best known of contemporary American authors,—Read a soldier; Taylor the representative of his country at St. Petersburg during the Civil War; Boker the President of the Philadelphia Union League, an active force in upholding the Union. Read's "Sheridan's Ride," and Boker's "The Black Regiment" and "Dirge for a Soldier," in energy, spirit or artistry, are unexcelled by any of our Civil War poetry. Taylor turned to the writing of novels, one of which, "The Story of Kennett," is a faithful picture of life in Southeastern Pennsylvania at the close of the eighteenth century, so simply told that the ingenuity of the plot is often overlooked. In most mystery novels the expert reader soon hits upon the secret. In "The Story of Kennett" the reader must perforce wait until the author chooses to make his disclosure.

Taylor's "Home Ballads" were published ten years after the Civil War. In them are drawn Pennsylvanian life and character with a faithfulness and understanding that could come only from life long familiarity. They do not depend for their effect upon peculiarities of dialect or custom, obvious to every eye or caught by the dullest ear, which lend themselves readily to the easiest recording by

the most callow of reporters. What has been called the near howling of the wolf of poverty, always in pursuit, hurries us on, but however hard we hold to a chosen course fate and fortune shape for us a different destiny. Such sincere life purposes, with their ambitions, disappointments and defeats, the contests between character and trial and the reaction of experience upon character are portrayed in Bayard Taylor's "Home Ballads," and no American poetry is more faithful to an author's surroundings and period. It has been a pleasure, it might be termed a duty, to call attention in this vicinity, consecrated by the life blood of his brother, here killed in battle at the head of his regiment, to the fact that Taylor, as well as Read and Boker, did not, as Professor Pattee asserts, neglect the opportunity of reacting upon the actual civic life of his life and time.

In literature there is needed not alone the social sense. The reaction from the overworking by novelists and poets of the exaltation of the submerged has already set in. Literature needs, besides the social sense, many qualities, among them perspective, restraint, form, the art which the practitioners of "free verse" have been trying with no great success to do without, the strength of substance, which is so markedly absent from many modern books, the filling of the well before it can slacken thirst, the inspiration and beauty, which makes Shakespeare, after three hundred years, a living force, or such poetry as Keats' sonnet, "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer" and Poe's poem "To Helen," marvels in those surprises which genius has in store.

Finally in the present time of war-fare and thought of our own possible national peril by way of the Pacific or the Atlantic, how applicable is this apostrophe to our country, suggested to the poet Read by Power's Statue of America!

"O thou, my country, may the future see
Thy shape majestic stands supreme as now,
And every stain which mars thy starry robe
In the white sun of truth, be bleached away!"

Hold thy grand posture with unswerving mien,
Firm as a statue proud of its bright form,
Whose purity would daunt the vandal hand
In fury raised to shatter! From thine eye
Let the clean light of freedom still disspread
The broad, unclouded, stationary noon!
Still with thy right hand on the fasces lean,
And with the other point the living source
Whence all thy glory comes; and where unseen,
But still all seeing, the great patriot souls,
Whose swords and wisdom left us thus enriched,
Look down and note how we fulfil our trust!
Still hold beneath thy fixed and sandal'd foot
The broken sceptre and the tyrants gyves:
And let thy stature shine above the world,
A form of terror and of loveliness!"

Chestnut Hill, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

RADICAL CHANGE IN CARNEGIE PENSION PLAN
FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS.

BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM A. GRANVILLE, PH.D., LL.D.

Ten years ago the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching put into operation a system for pensioning college teachers at the age of sixty-five or over who had served from twenty-five to thirty years as professors or instructors. The pensions allowed averaged about 60 per cent. of the salaries received at the time of retirement and have been paid from the income from an endowment of several million dollars set aside for that purpose by Andrew Carnegie. Only teachers in colleges fulfilling certain conditions have as a rule been admitted to this privilege, one condition being that the college must satisfy certain specified requirements as to scholarship standards, endowment and material equipment. With this condition few have found fault except in so far as it may have tended to set up arbitrary and artificial educational standards. Another condition, however, operated to exclude teachers in denominational colleges from these pension benefits. This unwarranted and unjust discrimination against denominational colleges aroused a loud indignation chorus at the time. A committee consisting of the heads of some of the most prominent denominational colleges of the country entered a formal protest against this ruling, but to no avail. That the first colleges in this country were denominational, that these colleges set the high standard of American education and have maintained it, that they have furnished the Church with its ministry, that these colleges have educated the great majority of our past and present leaders in all lines of activity, that today the vast mass of college students and college teachers are to be found in such colleges, of all these facts no account was taken. Every college with the least trace of denominational control was absolutely shut out.

But it is a long lane that has no turn. In Bulletin IX just issued by the Carnegie Foundation we find outlined "A Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities for College Teachers" by Henry S. Pritchett, President of the Foundation. The statement is made that after ten years of experience the original pension plan has been weighed and found wanting, and now it is proposed to proceed along entirely new lines in the future. The chief weaknesses of the present system of pensions maintained by the Carnegie Foundation are given to be:

1. A teacher acquires protection for himself and family only after twenty-five or thirty years of service. It holds out to the man of thirty a hope of security which is very likely to be illusory.
2. No permanent advantage will accrue to any calling by lifting from the shoulders of its members a load which under moral or economic laws they ought to bear.
3. There will develop in the long run a tendency to use the pension as an offset to higher salaries, so that a free pension is likely to be paid for by him who receives it at a higher rate than it would cost if he bought the annuity.
4. The Foundation does not now give the teacher a contract binding it to give him a pension after a term of years. It has from the first specifically reserved the right to cease paying a pension at any time for any reason.
5. It has been found a somewhat embarrassing use of trust funds for the Foundation to add say a \$2500 pension to a comfortable income already possessed by a retired teacher.
6. It has shown a tendency to restrict migrations of teachers from one college to another. It is in the interest of education that these migrations be free so that weak colleges may secure strong teachers.

President Pritchett has not, however, pointed out the greatest weakness in the existing pension system, which

is, that it excludes from its benefits without just cause the best and noblest and most deserving class of college teachers, namely the teachers laboring in denominational colleges. That such an inequitable pension plan should fail of best results was inevitable, it bore within itself the seeds of dissolution.

The new plan proposed by President Pritchett has not as yet been worked out in detail. Roughly it may be outlined as follows:

I. A sub-agency of the Foundation is to be incorporated according to the laws of the State of New York under the name of "The Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association," with a capital stock and surplus to be furnished and owned by the Foundation. It would offer only legitimate insurance including term insurance to end at age of sixty-five or later, ordinary life policies, and life policies paid up in twenty, twenty-five or thirty years. It will offer annuities for sale *one-half of the cost to be paid by the teacher and one-half by the college*. This dividing of the cost of an annuity (pension) between the teacher and the college is the "kernel in the nut" of the new plan.

II. A second sub-agency of the Foundation is to be organized under the name "The Teachers' Saving Association." The sole function of this agency would be to receive the payments from teachers and colleges, to invest them in sound securities and to guarantee a certain fixed rate of interest on same. Upon the retirement of the teacher, the accumulated capital would be paid to the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association for the purchase of an annuity. In case of death before sixty-five, the accumulated capital would either be returned to the widow or invested in an annuity for her. In case of retirement from the teachers' calling the accumulated capital would be returned with interest at an agreed rate.

That the above plan, backed by the Foundation's millions, will be safe, is obvious, and that the cost to teacher and college will be relatively low is evident from the fact that the Foundation will (a) pay the cost of administration, including the two sub-agencies. (b) It will undertake to carry the cost of invalidity (disability) pension in

the case of all teachers having insurance and annuity contracts. (c) It will be called on to pay part of the cost of pensions to widows. (d) It will pay taxes on insurance premiums and guarantee a good rate of interest on all accumulations.

The new plan contemplates the covering of the two main risks which confront the man entering the career of a teacher and affecting the welfare of himself and those dependent on him,—first, the risk of premature death during productive life; second, the risk of dependence when his income-earning power declines. The first can be met only by some form of insurance, the second by some form of annuity. The solution here presented consists of a combination of insurance at cost with an annuity available at a definite age.

While President Pritchett does not specifically state that teachers in denominational colleges will be admitted to the privileges of the new plan, and it is easy to understand why he does not make such a statement, he repeatedly points out as one of the strongest arguments in favor of the new plan that its benefits will be available to the great majority of college teachers instead of to only a relatively few as under the present system.

As the present pension system of the Carnegie Foundation offers nothing to denominational colleges it is clear that from their standpoint the new plan is much to be preferred. As far as our Lutheran institutions are concerned someone may say that because they have as a rule no available funds from which the college half of the cost of the annuity would be paid, the new plan would become for them practically inoperative. While that may be true as to present conditions it certainly will not hold for the future. Just as now our Lutheran colleges are gradually raising their standards of scholarship and equipment in order to successfully compete with first grade colleges so the time will surely come when it will be necessary for them to provide pensions for their teachers if they shall be able to secure the best men in the teaching profession. When that time comes the proposed new pension plan of the Carnegie Foundation will

be found to be a God-send, they will then be able to secure pensions for their teachers for less than half of what they would now cost.

Not the least of the advantages of the new plan will be that we shall in the future be spared the humiliating experience of witnessing an unseemly scramble by some denominational colleges to disown the churches by whom they were conceived, born and nourished, in order that their teachers may benefit by the present pension system.

Many such colleges have already had occasion to rue the day when they bartered their denominational heritage for a mess of pension pottage. Happily none of our Lutheran colleges have thus gone astray, and the adoption of this new Carnegie pension plan for college teachers will definitely remove the temptation to do so in the future.

*Pennsylvania College,
Gettysburg, Pa.*

ARTICLE V.

"THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF TO-DAY."

BY PROFESSOR HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, D.D.

Books on the Old Testament continue to multiply. In recent years we have had the long (and as yet incomplete) series of Prof. Charles Foster Kent, the books of Dr. Henry Preserved Smith in the *International Series* (Old Testament History, and The Religion of Israel), Peritz's *Old Testament History*, Peters' *Religion of the Hebrews*, the books of Prof. Eislen (particularly *The Christian View of the Old Testament*, and his *Biblical Introduction Series*—the first volume of which, on the Pentateuch, has just appeared), and a great number of others, like Bade's *Old Testament in the Light of Today*, dealing with the questions of the Old Testament less formally. Our review is limited to American books, and more particularly to the last-named volume. Prof. Bade's book has been widely advertized as presenting, in popular form, the findings of "modern scholarship" with respect to the Old Testament. It was written, the author tells us, before H. P. Smith's *Religion of Israel* and J. P. Peters' *Religion of the Hebrews* appeared, but it belongs to the same school. All of these books are miscalled; what we have in them is, The Old Testament in the Light of the Wellhausen Hypothesis, The Religion of Israel on the Basis of the Wellhausen Hypothesis, etc. While this hypothesis has had wide acceptance, it is not so wide as to make it synonymous with "Today."

It is true, as the author says, that two views of the Old Testament still contend for the mastery; but the line of division is not where he places it. He thus describes the two positions: "One regards the Old Testament as a sort of talisman, miraculously given and divinely authoritative on the subject of God, religion, and morals, in every part. The other regards it as a growth, in which the

moral sanctions of each stage of development were succeeded and displaced by the next higher one." The traditional position is set forth in two citations. A statement is quoted from J. H. Brookes' *Anti-Higher Criticism*: "The Bible itself knows of but one kind of inspiration, and that is an inspiration which extends to every chapter, verse, word, and syllable of the original Scriptures, using the mind and mouth, the heart and hand of the writers, guiding them in the least particular against blunder, and making their utterance the very Word of God to our souls..... The Scripture, and the entire Scripture, claims to be, and is in fact, altogether exempt from errors or mistakes of any sort." The second citation is from the prospectus of a California Bible Institute: "The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are without error or misstatement in their moral and spiritual teachings and record of historical facts. They are without error or defect of any kind." Against such a position the author revolts.

It is a question whether the Christian believer of the present day must be asked to limit himself to the view expressed in these citations. The extension of our knowledge in fields covered by the Old Testament has made the simple faith of such statements difficult for us. In relation to the Bible there are three main sources of knowledge from which we have derived ideas which call for interpretation—Archaeology, Comparative Religion, and Historical Criticism.

Archaeology has forced us to rewrite the early history of civilized man. It has pushed back millenniums the beginnings of human history. Time was when the Bible reader thought that the oldest records of the human race lay before him. "The giant figures of the patriarchs towered aloft in lonely grandeur. In their simple nomad life men saw the first beginnings of civilization." Archaeology has rewritten the book of human beginnings. "For many years it has been known that Egypt flourished centuries prior to Abraham; that it had an amazingly high civilization, which was old in his day; and that its political institutions were already greatly advanced.....

Babylonian archaeology has corroborated this... Thousands of inscriptions have been brought to light, by the help of which a knowledge of the life and customs of the people prior to Abraham's day is unfolded before our eyes, changing our entire conception of those distant times, and revealing a civilization which had advanced in an astonishing degree centuries before the patriarch. Instead of possessing only the names of a score or more individuals between Adam and Abram, as found in Genesis, many thousands became known. In a single document (the Obelisk of Manishtusu), for instance, written two thousand years before the patriarch, about five hundred names are given. And yet the great work of excavating the cities of ancient Babylonia is only in its infancy.¹ Abraham, we have come to see, stands only midway between the first civilization that we know and the coming of Christ. "The code of a great lawgiver, living as far behind the time of Moses as the age of Alfred the Great is behind us, speaks of the complex laws of property and public and private duty that are the surest signs of a long-established state." Moreover, parallels to the early stories of the Old Testament—the Creation and the Deluge—have been found on tablets of baked clay and cylinders, recensions one of another. Is it possible that no adjustment of our views is necessary in the light of these facts?

A similar question arises when we survey the widening fields of knowledge opened to us by Comparative Religion. From one point of view the results of this study have been pure gain. It has been most heartening, in this materialistic age, to have had borne in upon us with such overwhelming evidence that religion is a universal fact. It has been our stay and support. The comment of the editor of *Die Religio-geschichtliche Volksbücher*, a series of wide circulation in Germany which has for its object the dissemination of advanced liberalism, is of peculiar significance at this time. He says: "Today among the German people estrangement from religion is

¹ Clay, "Light on the Old Testament from Babel."

no longer received as 'progress.' Religion is again a vital problem for the people and its leaders." A similar conclusion is to be drawn from the many works which examine the phenomena of religion from the standpoint of psychology, demonstrating the universality of the facts of religious experience. Modern missionary enterprise has been greatly enlarged in its scope by the recognition of this fact. But while this is true—and the gain is keenly felt in the missionary field—it is also true that the Christian apologist who seeks to define the relation of his religion to the other religions of the world, has a new and complex task before him. Can we still hold that Christianity is the absolute religion and that the Bible gives us an exclusive revelation of God? Are there no other lines of convergence in Jesus Christ save those which run through the Old Testament? It is evident that we must be prepared to defend our faith in a new court.

Again, Christian faith has to define its attitude to the results of Higher Criticism as applied to the books of the Bible. I am speaking of the Old Testament here. Probably nine-tenths of Old Testament scholars accept some form of the Critical theory, involving, in its broadest outlines, the Source theory of the composition of the Pentateuch, progressive legislation, the gradual development of a central sanctuary, and the post-exilic origin of the Priest code. What effect does this theory have upon Christian faith? There are not a few devout scholars who believe that the reconstruction of the Old Testament on the basis of Criticism is an immense gain for Christian faith. It has brought home, they say, the presence of God in the life of the people. Instead of all the laws of a nation's religious life being given through one man, they were accumulated through centuries of time. Step by step God walked with His people. The supply of interpreters of the divine has never failed. In a natural evolution the religious life of Israel but matched the divine disclosure in the climax of the Priest code. So argued such scholars as Robertson Smith, the Davidsons, Driver and Skinner in Great Britain, and Briggs, Brown, Toy and Moore in America. We must respect the convictions

of such men. But it is clear again that the theory carries with it some heavy liabilities. E. g., to learn what seems to be the historical sequence of the institutions of Israel and to trace the analogies between them and those of other nations, is illuminating and valuable; but we must not assume that when that is done the work of explaining the origin of its ideas is done. The average intelligent Bible student is probably willing to suspend judgment as to the manner of the composition of the Pentateuch, for example. Luther once said, "What matters it if Moses should not have written the Pentateuch?" The great divide comes, not between theories of composition but between theories of interpretation. How are we to read the Old Testament as it stands? In reviewing Wellhausen's *History of Israel and Judah* (7th ed.), Prof. Wilke recently observed, "Geschichte lässt sich eben nur auf Grund ganz bestimmter Voraussetzungen schreiben"—which recalls the words of Princ. Fairbairn, "In Germany every speculation has its corresponding theological tendency." In 1834 Ed. Reuss was lecturing on Old Testament Theology at Strasburg, and by the development theory he found it psychologically impossible that a nation should begin its history with a fully developed code of laws. But how was he to explain the case of Israel? Criticism did not help him. At that time the results of Criticism were "assured"; and they were to the effect that a single ancient work (E) was taken up by a later writer (J) as the basis of a new and enlarged edition. This original record (*Grundschrift*) was amplified by degrees, by supplementing E with J, and this in turn with D and this combination in turn by E². "D" was put in the time of Manasseh. So far, with the exception of DeWette and Eichhorn, the Critics had aimed at reconciling the critical analysis with the historical trustworthiness of the dissected records. In other words, they were taking the sources at face value. Reuss said that it came to him as an intuition that the Prophets were earlier than the Law, and the Psalms later than both. In 1835, the year which

2 Cf. I Sam. 28:24; Gen. 27:9-14; Gen. 43:16; Judges 6:19.

saw the publication of the first edition of Bauer's *Leben Jesu*—the year following Reuss' intuition—Wm. Vatke published his *Biblische Theologie*, in which, avowedly from the Hegelian standpoint, he reached the same conclusion as Reuss, i. e., that Prophetism antedated Mosaicism, which must now be put late. This theory was brilliantly developed and popularized by K. H. Graf of Leipzig, a pupil of Reuss', and today the theory is very commonly known as the Grafian hypothesis. The post-exilic date of P now became the important question of Criticism, and it was while the discussion on this point was engaging the attention of Old Testament scholars that Wellhausen's *History of Israel* appeared (1878). Kuennen styled this work "the crowning fight of the long campaign of Criticism." Cornill says that since its appearance the whole science of Old Testament criticism has ranged itself around the question, for or against Wellhausen. Taking his cue from Vatke, whom he acknowledged as his master in Criticism, Wellhausen rang the changes on the famous Four Points of his theory:

(1). A central place of worship does not appear until Deuteronomy, which is not earlier than the 18th year of Josiah.

(2). Sacrifice was not originally localized but occurred in every slaughter and every meal. Only after Ezekiel is it limited to a central place and to the hands of the priests.

(3). The sacred calendar had a similar development from only the Spring festival at the time of sheep-shearing to three in JE and D, and five in P.

(4). Originally there was no distinction between Priests and Levites (cf. Deut.), that distinction coming in only with Ezekiel and the P code, when the sons of Zadok were reduced to hierodulic service.

Wellhausen's name is famous because with consummate literary skill he drew the picture of Israel which his premises required. Israel was but a desert tribe, like other Semites, and Israel's religion had a correspondingly low origin. The Patriarchs were adherents of animism and fetishism. In the beginning there was no real monothe-

ism or moral idea of God. The God of Israel came to be distinctly recognized after the occupation of the land of Canaan, in the conflict with the Canaanite gods. It was not until the eighth century B. C. that ethical monotheism, the religion of Israel, was created by the Prophets. In the legislation of the Priests, which followed the age of prophecy, this faith became stereotyped and authoritative. With a bold hand Wellhausen drew the conclusions of the radical critical hypothesis, and we may date from the appearance of his work the distinction between radical and conservative criticism. The Wellhausen school assumed an air of confidence, and it is not to be denied that its hypothesis has been accepted by a large number of Old Testament scholars. Two years ago Wellhausen's seventieth birthday was celebrated with a memorial volume, as is customary in Germany; and in the preface Wellhausen is crowned by Prof. Marti, of the University of Berne, as the Master. How completely he is the master these books which we have been considering show. Marti has written a *Religion of the Old Testament; its Place among the Religions of the Nearer East*, in which the author discards altogether the traditional view as to the residence of the early ancestors of the people in Mesopotamia, and begins with a picture of a number of bedawin tribes living in North Arabia and in the regions south of Palestine. It is, in fact, a rewriting of Wellhausen's *Das Heidenthum*. The religion of these people may be best described as polydaemonism, i. e., belief in a multitude of spiritual powers manifesting themselves in stones and trees, in springs and animals. Mount Sinai was the rendezvous of different Semitic tribes which sojourned in the regions round about. The God of this mountain was called Jahweh, and was conceived as the God of the higher sphere, as the God of the air and storms, in distinction from the powers of the earth. Moses, living among these people in banishment, had an intuition that this God was the God to deliver Israel, etc. Similarly Peritz in his *Old Testament History* (p.87) :

"The Biblical tradition clearly makes Moses Israel's discoverer of Jehovah and the medium by whom Jehovah

becomes the God of Israel. What the religious conceptions of the tribes were prior to Moses is no longer clearly discernable, for the superior force of the Jehovah religion drove the others from the field. Arguing from analogy of the growth of religions in general and the primitive stages of other Semitic religions, it has been concluded that the religion of Jehovah was preceded among the Hebrews by the various stages of animism and fetishism, and ancestor worship; but these manifestations lie far back of the historical period."

This is Wellhausenism and one of the "assured results" of radical Criticism. It is the basis of the book before us, the gist of "*The Old Testament in the Light of To-day.*" This is the way in which this school of Critics, whose souls are straightened for the truth, handle the sources of the religion they are studying. Bade says he feels called of God to start with facts and not with dogma. "Where the traditionalist," says Bade, "sees one unbroken plain of heaven-descended perfect morality, the thoughtful man of today finds 'a land of hills and valleys,' as the Deuteronomist said of Palestine." That is good rhetoric, but it were nearer the truth to say that the school of thinkers to which the author belongs sees in the Old Testament an unbroken plain of earth-evolved morality, as over against what he calls the "traditional" view that revelation is a land of hills and valleys, and that on these hill-tops we have something which is not accounted for by tribal customs, tribal laws or a series of myths and legends.

This book is but an echo of Robertson Smith's "*The Religion of the Semites,*" which in turn is an echo of Wellhausen. "*The Religion of the Semites*" is a rich mine of information concerning ancient Semitic practices as drawn from Arabic sources—the nature of the religious community, the relation of gods to their worshippers, holy places, sacrifice and the sacrificial ritual. It is of great value to the discriminating Bible student. But it is to be remembered that Robertson Smith saw no higher origin of sacrifice than the table-bond theory, after the analogy of bedawin compacts, in which the god and the

worshipper are knit together by bonds created by the interchange of hospitality. It rests upon the totemistic idea of reverencing an animal which is believed to share with men the divine nature. But, as has long since been pointed out, there is no evidence that totemism prevailed among the Semites, or that there was a relation between the common meal and sacrifice. "Originally all slaughter was sacrifice," says Robertson Smith, and this is an essential premise in his argument; but this is by no means borne out by the records.² Wellhausen admits that slaying and sacrifice are not coincident in the P code. Therefore, if the Critical theory should be found to be in error, the theory of the origin of sacrifice as a sacramental, table-bond rite falls. Moreover, as A. B. Davidson has pointed out, the theory fails to account for the burnt-offering, which was one of the earliest, most solemn, and, at times, the most important of all sacrifices.

Why should it be unscientific—i. e., a presumption of too advanced a stage of religious development—to say that sacrifice originated in the religious instinct? We find that instinct present very early among the Babylonians (IV R. 20, obr. 22ff.), "As the earth brings her tribute to her overlord, so the offerer brought his tribute." The divinity is represented as tasting the meat-offerings (Deluge text). Near the sacrificer stands the prayer-maker; the sacrifice is to incline the deity to the worshipper. The thought of atonement is not absent, for the term *Kuppuru* occurs. From this land between the Tigris and the Euphrates come our earliest records of the human race. It is a voluminous literature, rich in devotional writings. The constant note is penitence. So like the Psalms of Israel are the Babylonian penitential psalms that some scholars have said that the former have been taken from the latter. A cursory reading of these hymns and prayers (cf. Rogers' *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*) is sufficient to show that there is a closer relation with the genius of the Hebrew religion of the Old Testament sources than in the Hebrew religion of Wellhausen's and Smith's reconstruction. What is

lacking is the true God, not the human need, which is the mother of sacrifice.

How do the natural religionists explain sin? From the taboo. "A taboo may roughly be described as something that one must not do lest ill befall." After touching a corpse, or the blood of a sacrifice, or handling objects connected with the sanctuary, certain cautions were to be observed. "Holiness" and "uncleanness" were believed to be catching like a contagious disease, and the unpleasant consequences of the violation of a taboo might be communicated to a whole community. Thus the penalties for sin in the Old Testament are explained. Sin, in the sense in which the Prophets understood it, is an unknown idea among the early Israelites.³ The words "holy" and "unclean" have nothing to do with moral distinctions. Adam's sin was the violation of a food taboo; Achan's, the violation of devoted possessions. Bade makes St. Paul's doctrine of total depravity but the carrying over from the Old Testament of the idea of infection from a violated taboo. But this non-moral explanation of sin utterly fails to do justice to the sources. It is too late in the history of Bible interpretation to rob Gen. iii of its profoundly moral tone. As the distinguishing characteristic of the Hebrew conception of God lies in His ethical personality, so the distinguishing mark of man is his likeness to God. As Gordon has said, "we have here an ideal portrait of man as a moral personality, who can fulfil his true vocation only in home and social life through the various obligations and responsibilities of marriage, friendship, and work, but above all as a religious being, who reaches his highest life in fellowship with God, 'walking with Him,' doing His will, and thus growing 'like Him' in character. This representation of man's nature and destiny stands as far above the parallel myths of other nations as the Old Testament conception of God, even in its earlier stages, above theirs."⁴ And

³ "Good and evil, as spoken of in Gen. ii, iii, point to no contrast of some actions with others according to their moral distinctions.... They mean primarily nothing more than salutary and hurtful." Wellhausen. Prol. p. 301. Eng. tran.

⁴ The Early Traditions of Genesis, p. 153.

Budde, speaking of Gen. iii, says: "It wants nothing but the word sin. But though the word is absent, sin itself is there, and comes clearly to light before the mind of every reader. Indeed, attention has often been justly drawn to the fact that all the mental steps in the development of sin, up to the actual deed and its consequences, with all their shameful, degrading, miserable, and humiliating effects, have been traced and described, in a few words, with a mastery perhaps never approached. There is no need, then, for the author to give his readers a definite headline. If he were to ask them what spiritual power it was that had passed before their eyes, I at least would consider but one answer possible: viz., 'sin.' " (Bibl. Urgesch. pp. 70 f.) With this view of man Babylonian literature measurably agrees. With all its confusing polytheism and its low conception of deity (its gods are like titan men, moved by savage passions, striving by the pettiest tricks to upset each other's plans), it yet reflects a consciousness of sin which is not a matter of merely ceremonial commission or omission—the violation of some taboo of a god. While this idea is frequently expressed—it were strange if it were not—"it would be a great error to imagine," says Jeremias, "that the Babylonians did not include moral faults and feelings in their idea of sin."⁵ Faults which we recognize as vio-

⁵ The tables of exorcisms of the Shurpu series are evidences of this:

Has he caused division between father and son,
Has he caused division between mother and daughter

.....? Has he trespassed in his neighbor's house, approached his neighbor's wife, shed his neighbor's blood, stolen his neighbor's garment?

..... Has he been upright in speech, false in heart?
With his mouth full of yea, his heart full of nay?

Is it upon injustice that he has thought, to drive away the righteous, to destroy, to sin, to occupy himself with evil

Has he promised with his heart and mouth, but not kept it, by a (retained) gift despised the name of his God, consecrated something, but held it back

And from the famous Zimmern text (IV. R. 60):

I, myself, however, thought only of prayer and supplication, prayer was my rule, sacrifice my habit. The day of the god's wor-

lations of the Decalogue are confessed, while the conception of the Deluge as a punishment falling upon the sins of mankind and the myths of punitive visitations before the Flood seem to indicate primeval sin.

Similarly Bade looks upon the Decalogue in its Old Testament setting as an anachronism. The reason is, "the lawmaker does not precede, but follows the developing social conscience. What the lawgiver enacts into formal precept or law must previously have proved its worth in the collective experience.... It is a mistake to think that a Hebrew lawgiver could make eight o'clock into noon by pushing the hands of the clock around.... Belief in the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue in any of the forms in which it has come down to us may be regarded as abandoned by Most Old Testament scholars." Here follows a list of Wellhausen sympathisers. But again we may quote Critics of unquestioned scholarship against Bade. Prof. Kittel said several years ago: "Of late years, principally under the influence of Wellhausen—the idea was first mooted by Goethe, who perhaps did not mean it to be seriously adopted—the attempt has been made to maintain as a dogma of Old Testament criticism that the real and original Decalogue is not found in Exodus xx:1-17, but in Ex. xxxiv:11-26.... Ex. xxxiv:11-26 has never been a Decalogue, nor does it claim to be such. It is only a careless, and perhaps not serious, recension of v. 28 which led Goethe to take this position..... The passage cannot be reduced to ten precepts without omitting parts of the text. It is quite certain that the passage is nothing other than a parallel to the Book of the Cove-

ship was the joy of my heart, the day of the following of the goddess was to me profit and riches.

To do homage to the king, that was my joy; also to play to him, that was pleasant unto me. I taught my land to respect the name of God; to honor the name of the goddess, I instructed my people.....

If I but knew that before God such was well-pleasing.

But what seems good to oneself, that is bad with God; what is despicable to anyone's mind that is good to his God. Who has understood the counsel of the gods in heaven; the plan of a god full of darkness, who has fathomed it. How could be understood the way of my dim-sighted men! Cf. Jeremias: "Light from the Ancient Orient," I p. 225 ff.

nant.... There is no reason why these (the ten commandments of Ex. xx) should not be ascribed to Moses... In favor of the existence of a collection of such short fundamental laws in early Israel is the fact that the ancient Egyptians also had such a collection in their Book of the Dead." And König has argued with great patience that the great merit of Moses lies in the fact of his connection of the religious idea with the moral life. Similarly Jastrow says: "The Decalogue, which in its original form bears the stamp of Moses' personality, contains the germ of the teaching of the Prophets that Jahweh is a God of justice and mercy who demands as a condition of blessing obedience to laws which have a distinct ethical tone."

It all comes back to this question—and this is the real point of departure between the positive and the negative schools of Criticism—at what point in the history of Israel did the great awakening to ethical monotheism, which constituted Israel the peculiar people of God, enter? Did it come, as the Wellhausen school says, with the great prophets of the 8th century B. C., or did it come, as the sources say, with Moses? When it is said that the prophets of the 8th century B. C. were the creators of Israel's religion, it is an accommodation to a presupposition and not a setting forth of the facts as they lie in the sources. It has again and again been pointed out⁶ that the prophets of the 8th century B. C. were, according to their own testimony, primarily only reformers. They had the mission of bidding their contemporaries turn back to the religion as founded in Israel's youth (Hos. 11:1) and of protesting against all the moral and religious deviations by which smaller and larger circles in Israel had denied that religion. The prophets imply a

6 In König's "Die Hauptprobleme," and "Die Geschichte der alt-test. Religion"; in James Robertson's "The Early Religion of Israel"; in Kittel's "Die Geschichte der Hebräer"; in Oettli's "Der Kultus bei Amos u. Hosea"; in Sellin's "Beiträge zur isr. u. jud. Religionsgeschichte"; in Giesebrécht's "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes"; in Volz's "Mose"; in von Orelli's article on "The Religion of Israel" in the Int. Bib. Enc., etc.

background. They hold Israel to a standard, and that standard was "the law as given by Moses."

What scientific objection is there to the Biblical theory of Israel's religion? Archaeology has pushed back the beginnings of human history and shown that a high degree of civilization and literary activity flourished prior to the date even of the Patriarchs. Why should not this fact be welcomed? What is the determining principle of the Wellhausen reconstruction of Old Testament history? Wm. Vatke, from whom Wellhausen admitted that he had "learned the most and the best," has frankly given the reason. It is the Hegelian principle of development. He says: "The historical course of the religion of the Old Testament comes to light as the outcome of the whole movement. If the tradition of the Hebrews gave the real course of the history of this people and its religion, we should find ourselves face to face with an enigma to which we can find absolutely no analogy; we should have the culmination at the beginning." But is it a fact that the "culmination" is "at the beginning?" The historical tradition in the Old Testament runs in the path of a steady development. There is a development in the religious conceptions of Israel—in regard to the names of God and His attributes, and in the matter of legislation and prophecies. But this development, so far as the sources disclose the facts to us, does not begin with totemism and animism, but, at the worst, only with "strange gods" (Josh. 24:2, 15). The Patriarchs knew God and had communion with Him; they heard His voice, and they knew who spake to them. "The prophetic factor, which goes through the entire history of Israel and constitutes the life-principle that fills its religion and causes its further development, is at the very first beginnings the source whence the knowledge of God is taken." (Orelli). This presupposes from the beginning a personal God, who stands over against Israel at every stage of the nation's religious history. The manifestations of this God differ with the successive stages of Israel's expanding intelligence, advancing from the family covenant with Abraham to the national covenant under Moses, and from this,

when the nation broke down, to the covenant of Jeremiah and the Prophets, but it is the same God who appears in the sources from Genesis to the end.

But should the sources show "the culmination at the beginning," why should not the historian acknowledge it? It is scientific to find history in its sources, not to evolve it out of a philosophical theory. "The self-consciousness of Israel," says A. B. Davidson, "is a phenomenon almost more singular than the religion itself." The records of Israel are so remarkable because the nation had such a remarkable consciousness of its mission. A nation records its history only when it becomes conscious that it has a history to record, and what it records bears the antecedent probability in its favor as to the order and importance of its epochs. It is just possible that Hegelian evolution does not explain Israel's religious history and that the Old Testament in the light of today will turn out to be the Old Testament in the light of the Bible.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VI.

THE RELATION OF FAITH AND WORKS.

BY REV. G. ALBERT GETTY.

By many it has been thought that there is a radical difference, if indeed not an absolute contradiction, between the teachings of Paul and those of James on the subject of justification, and at first sight it might appear that such was the case. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, says, "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight," (3:20) and again, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (3:28). St. James, on the other hand, declares, "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone," (2:17) and a little further on in the same chapter says, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (2:24).

As a matter of fact, however, there is no real conflict between the teachings of these two inspired writers. Each views the truth from his own standpoint. Each one is seeking to emphasize the aspect of truth which appears to be of most vital concern to those to whom he is writing, and, as is so often the case, the whole truth is to be found by placing their teachings side by side, and blending them one into the other.

It is not to be denied that this apparent conflict in the truths presented by Paul and James has often been the occasion of much honest perplexity on the part of sincere and earnest Christians. It must likewise be admitted that differing apprehensions of the vital truth upon this all-important subject have been the cause of much bitter theological controversy. The Romish system is founded upon the idea of "work-righteousness," that is, that a man's good deeds may be made to contribute to his salvation, or to put it in the language of James, "By works a man is justified, and not by faith only." In the practical working out of this system, great stress is laid upon

the value of external acts of self-denial, penance, and the like. Protestantism came into being from the re-affirmation of the cardinal truth of the New Testament, that a man is saved by faith in Jesus Christ, and by nothing else. It holds fast to the gospel message enunciated in John 3:16: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have eternal life." Over against the "work-righteousness" of Rome, Luther and his co-laborers planted themselves upon the position of Paul, and used as their battle cry the oft-repeated words of sacred Scripture, "*The just shall live by faith.*"

It is to be remarked, however, that in the rebound from the extreme position of the Roman Catholic Church, the pendulum did not swing to the other extreme of its arc. The conservatism which marked the great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, is one of the strongest proofs of the fact that it was the work of the Spirit of God, rather than the work of men.

Martin Luther himself, in the earlier years of his life, sought peace for his troubled soul, in the faithful performance of all the external acts required of him by the Church of Rome. He even entered into an Augustianian monastery and there performed the most menial tasks in the hope that he might thus obtain assurance of divine pardon and eternal salvation for his soul. But these things failed to bring comfort to his troubled heart, and his mental and spiritual struggles grew more intense with the passing of the months. Then he found a copy of the sacred Scriptures and applied himself to a diligent study of this wonderful book. Here he found the precious doctrine of salvation by grace, of the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and upon his consciousness dawned the glorious truth that a sinner is justified in the sight of God by *faith* in Jesus Christ. This message from the divine word brought comfort to his soul; he turned to Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world and at His feet found the promised rest; he cast his burden of guilt upon the Lamb of God who was sacrificed upon Calvary, and his heart was filled with peace and joy. From this time on, it be-

came the one great object of his life to make this life-giving truth known unto others, to share with them the great blessings which had come into his own inner experience. "Justification by faith" became the one great theme of his teaching and preaching. In defense of this truth he was willing to give his testimony before kings and cardinals, scholars and knights. Around this truth he grouped all other teachings of the word, so that his system of doctrine as it gradually developed became *Christo-centric*, that is to say, *Christ* was the pivotal center around which everything else revolved.

But there were those who when they received this doctrine of Luther's, turned their backs upon the commandments and precepts of the divine word and sought to cast contempt upon all efforts to live a righteous life. So far indeed did some of these misguided people go in their utter disregard for the law of God that grave scandals broke out, and in 1537, one who at an earlier date had been closely associated with Luther, wrote, "All who follow Moses must go to the devil; to the gallows with Moses." Such utterances filled the heart of Luther and colleagues with sorrow and concern. For not only did it react against the cause of evangelical reform, but it brought into reproach the glorious gospel of the Lord Jesus, and led men from truth into error, from salvation to perdition. Against all such pernicious distortions of the truth the Reformers raised their voice and pen, and in the midst of the troubled waters, sought to steer with a firm hand between the rocks on either hand.

In the matchless Confession of Faith presented by the Reformers at Augsburg on June 25th, 1530, the subject is fully treated, and if to-day there are those who have any difficulty in understanding the relation between faith and works, and the part which each plays in salvation, the careful reading of the Sixth Article of the Augsburg Confession, which treats of the subject of the New Obedience ought to make the matter clear. The Sixth Article of the Confession reads thus:

"They [our churches], likewise teach, that this faith must bring forth good fruits; and that it is our duty

to perform those good works which God has commanded, because it is his will, and not in expectation of thereby meriting justification before him. For, remission of sins and justification are secured by faith; as the declaration of Christ testifies: "When ye shall have done all those things say, we are unprofitable servants." The same thing is taught by the ancient ecclesiastical writers, for Ambrose says, "This has been ordained by God, that he who believes in Christ shall be saved without works, receiving a remission of sins gratuitously through faith alone."

In considering more particularly the teaching of this Article of the Confession, let me first of all direct your attention briefly to the subject of Justification by Faith. One of the most difficult things that the average man has to do is to recognize clearly his own utter inability to save himself or even to contribute towards his own justification in the sight of God. An eminent preacher of a by-gone generation said in one of his sermons, "Whoever is acquainted with the nature of mankind in general or the propensity of his own heart in particular, must acknowledge that self-righteousness is the last idol that is rooted out of the heart." (Whitefield). This is only too true. It is natural for a man to seek to justify himself; it is difficult for him to realize that his righteousness is but as filthy rags in the sight of that pure and holy God with whom we have to do, and to cast himself entirely upon the free grace of God as manifested to the world in Jesus Christ. We sing, but too often without realizing the solemn import of the words:

"Just as I am, without one plea
But that thy blood was shed for me
And that thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come."

Yet in that hymn is voiced the teaching of sacred Scripture. So also in that other hymn so dear to the heart of the believer:

"Nothing in my hand I bring
Simply to thy cross I cling
Naked, come to Thee for dress,
Helpless, look to Thee for grace,
Foul, I to the fountain fly,
Wash me, Saviour, *or I die.*"

It is the clear teaching of the divine word that no man can save himself. We are all of us sinners, and are justified freely, gratuitously, through the mercy and the grace of God. Paul argues the entire subject at length in the Epistle to the Romans and concludes his argument in the oft-quoted words: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3:28). Luther wrote: "*No one but Jesus Christ has died for our sins; but if He be the only one who takes away our sins, we cannot do this by our works.*" Justification by faith is the central teaching of the New Testament, upon which must rest our hope of justification and salvation, and there is no doctrine so full of comfort to anxious and troubled souls as this.

But now the question arises as to good works. What are good works? Why are they necessary? In what spirit and with what motive are they to be performed?

To all these questions the sixth article of the Confession gives clear and definite answers. It draws a clear distinction between all merely external or legalistic observances imposed by human tradition or decree and those practical Christian duties which God has commanded in His Word. In the view of the reformers "good works" do not consist in the observance of those requirements which the Church of Rome seeks to lay upon the consciences of her people and which may be performed in a mere perfunctory manner, but in the discharge of such duties and the practice of such virtues as are commanded in the sacred Scriptures. In the Saviour's day there were Pharisees in the city of Jerusalem who delighted in the outward show of religion, but who knew nothing of its inner power,—who made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments, who loved the up-

permost seats at festivals and feasts and the reverential greetings of men in the marketplaces, who were scrupulous in the observance of every minute requirement of that vast system of ceremonial law which had grown up around the original salutary code given at Sinai, who even tithed the mint and anise and cummin with which the dishes upon their tables were seasoned, but who, alas, neglected altogether the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith. They followed the traditions of men rather than the commands of God, and the Saviour denounced them as hypocrites. It was not such "good works" that God had commanded, for the prophet Micah had said, "He hath showed thee, O man what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6:8).

So also in the time of the Reformers there had grown up a system of external observances which in the eyes of the Church of Rome possessed great merit and which were said to have a value in offsetting the sins of men. The observance of fast days, the recitation of *pater noster*s and *ave marias*, donations to churches and the shrines of the saints, the purchase of indulgences, and other similar practices, all fostered the development of a system of hypocrisy which was utterly at variance with the simplicity and spirituality of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. These things were not the "good works" which God had commanded in His Word, and against them the Reformers raised their earnest protest.

But there were good works commanded by God in sacred Scripture, where the follower of the Lord Jesus is called upon to live a holy life and to put into daily practice the beautiful virtues which our Lord exemplified during the period of His incarnation, and upon these the framers of our confession insisted vigorously. Love to God and fellowmen, charity, kindness, patience, self-denial, forgiveness, a willingness to do unto others as we would have others do unto us,—these are some of the things which God has named as elements of Christian character or rules for Christian conduct, and all such

good works are to be performed. The New Testament is full of exhortations dealing with the practical duties of life. The Sermon on the Mount with its seal of approval upon the commandments of the Decalogue and its admonitions "Judge not that ye be not judged," etc.; the graphic portrayal of the Final Judgment with its "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"; the parable of the "Good Samaritan" with its "Go thou and do likewise"; and many other utterances of our Lord indicate clearly that there are many "good works" which our Lord would have us do. To learn them all it would be necessary for us to read the entire Word of God, but all things there commanded it is our *duty* to do. The Christian is not free from all obligation in this matter merely because his sins are forgiven and he is justified before God, but on the contrary it becomes all the more his duty then to perform these good works which God has commanded.

These good works, however, are not to be performed in expectation of meriting any reward therefore and least of all with the idea that we thereby obtain salvation and eternal life, but merely because it is God's will that we should do them and it is therefore *our duty* so to do.

It is of the utmost importance from every point of view that a man should as far as possible learn God's will with regard to himself, and having learned it, to conform his own life and will to that of his Maker. In the very nature of the case it is utter folly for any human being to seek to go contrary to the purpose for which he was created. Back deep in the mind of the Infinite Creator lay originally the plan and purpose of human life and the ultimate goal and destiny of humanity. All the commands and precepts of the Divine Word are but indications of that divine will and purpose and it is of the utmost importance for each and every man to learn that purpose and to bring his own life into harmony with it. Only thus will he attain unto the best things either here or hereafter.

But to the Christian there are higher considerations. Jesus Christ has revealed God in the character of a

Father and taught us that all the redeemed sustain to him the relation of children. In every properly constituted family *the child obeys the parent*, not because it fears the rod of punishment, but because it loves the parent, because it recognizes the fact that the parent loves the child and desires its highest good, and because it therefore recognizes the *right* of the parent to require implicit and unquestioning obedience. What is true in the human family is pre-eminently true in the family of God. He knows what will be for the best interests of all His children, and He desires only their welfare and happiness. When therefore He speaks to us, as He does in His Word, it is *the duty* of every true child to obey, not in expectation of receiving any reward therefor, but simply because the Father commands it. To the redeemed child of God the commandments are not the stern and harsh edicts of a despot, to which a grudging obedience is to be rendered, but the clear indications of a loving Father's will, which the child is glad to get and anxious to fulfill. The true child of God obeys the commandments because it is God's will that he should do so, because it is his clear duty to do so, and because in his heart there is an abiding *faith* that his Heavenly Father does all things well and asks of His children only those things which are for their own good.

Inasmuch as this relationship of the redeemed child to the Heavenly Father is made possible only by Jesus Christ, and can be enjoyed only by those who believe in Him, the New Obedience may be described properly as the *Fruit of Faith*. The Confession goes further, however, and says that it is the *necessary fruit of faith*. "This faith must bring forth good fruits." It is the very nature of faith to show itself in good works. Hence it is that James says, "Faith without works is dead."

The steps or processes by which the fruit of good works is produced are as plain and as easily traced as are the different stages in the development of the plant. From the grain of corn that is put in the ground there springs, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." From the living faith which lays hold upon Jesus

Christ as the Saviour from sin and death there springs up a beautiful relationship in which the sinful man has been regenerated and made a child of God. As a child of God, he must *think, feel, speak, and act, as a child of God.* As a child of God, he must grow and develop into the full stature of perfect manhood. As a child of God, he must "put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt," and "put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. 4:22-24). All these things are the natural and necessary consequences of a living faith in the heart, and the faith must thus produce its proper fruitage, or like the seed whose development is checked, *it will die.*

Possibly it would be well to call attention to the fact also, that without such faith, it is impossible to bring forth such good works. Faith is the seed. Good works are the fruit. Without the proper seed we cannot hope for the fruition of the harvest time. Men may make artificial representations of the fruit, but it is not the real thing. Men may develop a character which is *morally* correct. But it is not difficult to tell that it is not the genuine article, but only a skillful imitation. God's Word declares, "Without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. 11:6). And again, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23). The germ, therefore, whence spring all works that are really good, is faith—a living, working, justifying faith, which transforms the heart and life and makes of the sinner a child of God.

The spirit of the Christian's obedience is therefore the spirit of filial love and reverence. The motive is a desire to please our kind Father in heaven. The obedience of the child of God is not that of the abject slave who fears the lash of punishment inflicted by the law, but the free and cheerful obedience of the grateful son or daughter who desires to please the Father whose love and care he has enjoyed, and who has loaded them with benefits. It is obedience rendered in the spirit of the boy Jesus who when twelve years of age astonished his parents by asking them the question, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" It is the obedience of the disci-

ple to whom his Lord has said, "*If ye love me, keep my commandments.*"

Let me sum up the entire matter by quoting several brief passages from the writings of that great Reformer whose profound spiritual experiences are interwoven into the Confession and the doctrines of our Church. Luther says:

"By faith alone in Christ, and not by the works of the law, or love, are we declared righteous; not that we reject works and love, as the adversaries accuse us, but that we do not allow ourselves to be diverted from the state of the present case."

"Faith brings with it a band of most beautiful virtues, nor is it ever alone; but on this account, different things are not to be confused, and what belongs to faith alone be ascribed to the rest. Faith is the mother whence these virtues, as children, are born. Unless faith had first embraced the promises concerning Christ, the other virtues would not be present."

"Hence these two sayings are correct: good and godly works never make a good and godly man; but a good and godly man does good works. Evil deeds never make a bad man, but a bad man commits evil deeds."

"We are justified by faith alone, and yet it is never alone."

"Oh, it is a living active, busy thing that we have in faith! It is impossible for one who has faith to do otherwise than incessantly to do good. He asks not whether good works are to be done, but before such a question can be asked, he has done them and is always busy." (Quotations from Jacob's Life of Luther, pp. 362 and 364).

Such then is the New Obedience, an obedience springing out of *faith*, an obedience prompted by *love*, an obedience rendered gladly, cheerfully, *joyfully* by the grateful child to the loving Father in Heaven. May God give His people grace to serve Him in the spirit of this new obedience.

York, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SOCIAL PROGRAM OF LEO XIII.

BY REV. O. H. PANNKOKE.

The fortunes of the papacy are as strange and varying as are the fortunes of nations. When Leo XIII ascended the papal throne his office had little splendor and influence but abundant opposition, hatred and contempt even among catholic nations. When finally, after a reign exceptional for its length, he passed away, the civilized world, Protestants in instances more than Catholics, heaped eulogies upon him and his position and the institution which he had governed during a perilous time with such singular success. Leo, indeed, was a diplomat of that finished Italian school of diplomacy which more than once rescued the papacy from apparent doom. He knew the value of his influence and the weight of Catholic sentiment amid the difficulties of modern governments and he was able to barter them in exchange for that wider influence on the affairs of the world which the papacy has ever loved so dearly. However, the real significance of his reign lies not here, in the field of diplomacy. It lies rather in the insinuating qualities of his social program which was conceived as the master stroke to gain influence over modern life. Diplomacy dies with the man who practiced it. It is hampered by the party ties which bind its carrier. An idea, a program is free to live, it can seek its adherents and champions among all parties. So the social program of Leo has lived on after his death, has gone out among people opposed to the Church and her principles and won them with its insinuating proposals.

The roots of Leo's program lie far back in history. They date back to the Reformation. To the Catholic the Reformation has ever meant the breakdown of everything good in society. It destroyed government, the family, prosperity, peace, order, faithful application to duty. It brought in anarchy, selfishness, bitter class

struggles, indolence on the part of the lowly, grasping greed on the part of the rulers. Modern society to the Catholic mind is a body filled with noisome distempers, covered with putrescent ulcers, passing through the last paroxysms before death relieves it. One must, of course, bear in mind in reading Catholic expressions, especially official expressions, that their phraseology is the rolling, unctious bombast of medieval learning handed down from the ancient schools of rhetoric. But even with that qualification the Catholic picture of modern days is dark and hopeless without a ray of light. The great literary representatives of this attack on the Reformation from the social side are Pistorius in the 16th and Doellinger and Janssen in the 19th century, with a host of lesser lights who either followed their pioneer work in smaller special investigations or popularized their contentions.

It is hardly possible to over-estimate the service rendered by these great writers to the social program of Leo. They give it proper setting and background. They provide its fullest apology. Through their preparatory work it receives that impressive, dramatic setting which is so valuable in gaining control over the emotions of the unthinking crowd. For in discussing present day social unrest they are dealing with facts felt and feared by all, in looking to the future with foreboding they are giving expression to sentiments prominent in many minds, and they are using one of the commonest and most effective human appeals when they speak of the golden age that was and is no more. With these two fundamental facts at their disposal it is not very difficult with a credulous audience to shift the blame onto the turning point from medieval to modern life: the Reformation.

Prominent in a discussion of Leo's program must be his analysis of the causes for social disorders. The foremost cause is the overthrow of the holy venerable authority of the Church. Closely akin to that is the passing of the temporal sovereignty. "When the temporal sovereignty of the apostolic see is in question, the cause of the public good and the well being of all human society in general are also at stake." Next to these evils touching more on

the organization of society come a long category of modern principles and ideals which are vigorously condemned and made responsible for the present difficulties. There is the false science which dethroned Thomas of Aquin and the schoolmen. There is education outside of Church control. There is the custom of civil marriage without the sacramental sanction of the Church. All these evils date back to the Reformation. It enthroned reason, founded governments without God, secularized education in universities and common schools and in this latter day leads men to fix eager eyes on the abodes and fortunes of the wealthy. Finally there are adduced a few economic reasons, unchecked competition, rapacious usury and large scale production.

From the religious side this analysis is a proof of papal ambition, power over every side of human life, the political, intellectual and economic no less than the religious. Its social significance is more noteworthy at present. Leo opposes any spontaneous natural growth of society from within to meet the tasks and problems of each succeeding generation. He knows only the ideal of external control. Without that control he cannot conceive of well ordered society. He runs into that grave error so common among traditional thinkers that in judging the present he applies the fixed categories and modes of thoughts of the past and leaves no room for organic changes and growth in human society.

The underlying tendencies of the program become more apparent in seeing what it opposes. Socialism and radicalism head the list. They do that because they propose changes in property right and greater democracy. In connection with them he condemns popular government and the abolition of classes as well as any impatience on the part of the poor with their lot not to speak of attempts to change conditions by force. The paternal interests and efforts of the State also meet with little favor. The solution of the social question is not the sphere of the State, especially not if it goes about it independently of the Church. Still less are economists called upon to pro-

pose remedies unless they have first listened to the teachings of the Church.

After thus clearing the field Leo proceeds to positive ideas and suggestions. The social question is predominantly religious and moral. Its real remedy lies in Christianity as conceived by the Catholic Church. So soon as her sway extends over all, self-interest will be curtailed and mutual love overcome all evils. The rights of private property in all their extent must be protected and the supremacy of the upper classes maintained. Society depends on class distinctions, but the interests of the classes are alike and through Christianity it will not be difficult to make them all join hands in brotherly union. The special duty of the poor is to obey, to practice meekness and submission and be satisfied with their lot. After all this world will always know poverty and a short period of poverty will be followed by eternal bliss. So why be impatient with want. The rich shall be inclined to generosity. Their contribution to the solution of the social question is to practice alms-giving. "Therein lies the best means of appeasing the undying conflict between the rich and the poor." To attain this end the Church officials are urged to enlist the rank, wealth and culture of the community.

The real sufferers from social inequalities and injustice receive very little consideration in this program except the pittances of charity. The program appeals to the rich and powerful. It appeals to their self-interest to keep things as they are and prevent changes which may curtail their power and divide their wealth. It is essentially the program of the extreme conservative which will not permit the slightest change in the organization of industrial society. The great demands of the fourth estate: popular government in the fullest sense of the word and a more equitable distribution of wealth are entirely brushed aside and charity and the hope of eternal bliss are held out where the imperative demand is for justice and equality.

Leo aimed to carry his ideas into practice by fostering labor organizations under the control of the Church.

Especially Germany has had many of these Catholic labor organizations. In Leo's mind they are hardly more than social gatherings where the interests of the group may be discussed without the right to any definite action. And Leo's hope as expressed was that many erring might be brought back into the safe haven of the Church. The really effective weapons were denied them: class solidarity, political action and strikes. In actual operation they developed more and more along the line of routine secular labor bodies. The class spirit developed and was expressed on the floor of their meetings and conventions as vehemently as among the others. Their leaders as well as the rank and file more and more opposed clerical interference and turned the organization into an economic weapon to attain actual results for labor. In America the policy has been rather to control the existing labor organizations and make them conform to the dictates of the Church.

Now who shall carry out this program? Modern society places the responsibility upon the State. Its duties are no more the mere police functions as an earlier day conceived them. But it is called upon to protect as well as foster the physical, mental and moral interests of individuals and groups in society. On the strength of that ever-growing idea were enacted that great body of social laws protecting health, determining hours of labor, protecting special classes against the weight of the industrial system. Leo does not grant the State this right. For him the Church is the real leader in reform. Rulers and governments shall listen to the dictates of the Church, shall carry through by force what the Church cannot attain by suasion. But without the Church there is no salvation. All her officials are urged to take an interest in the matter and use their influence to make the control of the Church supreme.

Stripped of all its embellishments and rhetoric the far-famed social program of Leo XIII looks simple and harmless, in places a bit naive. However, it must be remembered that it appeals to that class which has the balance of power in modern society, the wealthy. Their ideal is

to curtail the power and interference of the State and make the lower classes happy and satisfied with their lot. It is strange how in this world, the possession of wealth inevitably makes men conservative and opposed to change. With the lack of conscience in much of modern business life the insinuating appeal of the Catholic Church to keep things as they are may readily win response and assistance. It is reported that the society for the propagation of the faith has actually sent out letters of appeal to prominent non-Catholic financiers appealing for financial assistance on the ground that the Catholic Church is the best insurance against radicalism. In the current literature of the Catholic Church that appeal is not strange. It is one of the stock phrases. To worry about business men's souls who will join a Church on such grounds is hardly worth while. The only question of interest in the situation is an academic one: Have they a soul at all? Still less is it worth while to be envious of a Church which gains influence in this way. But what effect has this program on the natural growth and progress of society? The two definite lines of development in society are on the one hand to make the ideal of democracy conceived a century ago real and to bring about a more just distribution of wealth. Stated in another way, it is the emancipation of the workingman to a position of political influence and just wealth. The demand of the workingman is just and succeeding years have brought him closer and closer to his goal besides giving him that self-respect and confidence which is the essential of success. The grave danger in the situation lies in the possibility of forcibly retarding this progress that it will no more be a natural peaceful evolution but a destructive revolution bringing suffering upon all. Whether Catholic influence will be strong enough to bring about this situation only the future can tell. One thing is clear in a survey of the present social unrest, a great factor is the social program of Leo XIII with its appeal to the self-interest of the well-to-do.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION.

Was it a Revelation or an Evolution?

BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

We have been moved to write this article by the reading and re-reading of Frederick William Bade's recently published book, "The Old Testament in the Light of Today." The book belongs to the class of the radical criticism, and is one of the most negative works we have ever read. Dr. Bade is the professor of Old Testament Literature and Semitic Languages in Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, California. After reading all his slashing criticisms of the Old Testament, its moral teaching, its theology and its history, we could not help wondering why a man holding such views should want to be a teacher in a theological school founded by Christian people (it was founded by the Congregationalists, though now it is non-denominational), and especially why he should want to be a teacher of the Old Testament. Students trained for the ministry under such a regime surely cannot go out in the world with much of a message. The author not only represents the Old Testament as a very defective book morally and religiously, even a very wicked book in some ways, but also thinks that Christ's disciples corrupted the teachings of their Master after His departure from them. Thus it would seem that there is not much of the Bible left for the student who graduates from the Pacific Seminary, if he swallows the teaching of Professor Bade.

The author's liberalism is also made obvious from the men who have commended his work and to whom he refers with "grateful acknowledgments" in his preface. Among them are Karl Marti, Dr. Charles F. Aked and Winston Churchill, the last the author of "The Inside of the Cup." Besides, a circular from the publishers contains an enthusiastic endorsement of the book by Mr. Churchill. This writer of fiction with a theological coloring displays his critical depth and intelligence by saying

of Dr. Bade's book, "Above all, it is constructive." We wonder what Mr. Churchill's ideas of "constructive" teaching are, anyway; for after reading through the book, we are moved to say that, according to the author, the Old Testament is about as worthless a production as was ever foisted upon a long-suffering world.

The author's position may also be seen from the list of authorities he cites, especially in a footnote on page 88. Among them are the following: Budde, Cornill, Kuenen, Marti, Oort, Snend, W. R. Smith, H. P. Smith, Stade, Steuernagel and Wellhausen. Even though Kuenen's and Stade's works were published away back in 1877-1887, Dr. Bade still cites them as authorities. But throughout his whole work he never makes a single allusion to such conservative authors as Keil, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Klostermann, Orelli, Moeller, Cave, Orr, Girdlestone, Urquhart, Green, McGarvey, Robertson (of Glasgow), Wiener, Wilson, et al. So completely does he ignore the conservative and evangelical Old Testament scholars (except to scoff at their views and misrepresent them) that the reader would think there were so few of them as to be a negligible quantity. Compare with this studied avoidance of evangelical writers the method of Dr. William Henry Green in his great work, "The Unity of the Book of Genesis," who uses over two pages in citing the books referred to in his volume; among them are nearly all the liberal authors from Astruc to Kuenen; and, of course, to be fair, he also cites a fine list of evangelical scholars. Note also the extensive bibliography on pages 543-547, over four pages of fine print, in Dr. James Orr's "The Problem of the Old Testament." We simply make these comparisons to show the difference between the methods of a radical and a conservative critic. Dr. Orr's list contains nearly every author, conservative and liberal, who, up to 1905, had ever done anything noteworthy in Old Testament research.¹ No wonder Dr. Bade goes on

I. Here it might be well to call attention to the great list of conservative Biblical scholars who have written for "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," edited by Dr. Orr and others and published within the last year.

repeating the old, threadbare objections to the Old Testament as if they had not been answered by evangelical scholars again and again.

Our purpose, however, is not to give a general critique of Dr. Bade's work, but to call attention to his main view-point, which forms the keystone to the whole structure he has erected. Nowhere does he accept the Old Testament at its own estimate, or from its own point of view, but he reconstructs its whole history to fit it into his own scheme of evolution. A number of citations will indicate both the spirit and the view-point of the author. As we proceed, we shall offer some remarks on the quotations.

In beginning his preface he says that the "one thing of supreme importance, actually and historically, is the idea of God." It is tautological to say "actually and historically," for when a thing is historical, it is actual. Then he adds concerning the idea of God: "This idea did not come in full feather, nor fall as a bolt from the blue." Both these expressions are slangy, and therefore are not in good taste, especially right at the beginning of a work on so serious and important a subject. Besides, they are intended as a gibe at the orthodox view. But, as is almost always the case with the girds of the liberalist, it is an untrue representation of the convictions held by conservative scholars. Not one of them that we know of has ever held that the idea of God "came in full feather." An outstanding principle of conservative historical criticism is that the revelation of God in the Bible was progressive; that God led His people along from point to point, making His revelation fuller and fuller all the way. Everybody knows, even those who make no pretense to scholarship, that the Old Testament was preparatory, and that God unfolded His plan by degrees until the "fullness of time" came. So in the second sentence of his book Dr. Bade has misrepresented the orthodox position, and has set up a man of straw. Not a very promising beginning for a book which, according to Winston Churchill, is "above all constructive."

A few sentences further on, the author says: "The

helpful teacher of the Old Testament now employs the higher achievements of Israel's religion as grave-diggers for the defunct moral crudities that have dropped by the way. The usual procedure has been to embalm them with a 'Thus saith the Lord,' and to carry them along until the living expire under the dead."

Here is another fling at both the Bible and orthodoxy. Yes, a fling at the Bible, because it contains the expression, "Thus saith the Lord," many times, and Dr. Bade will simply have to cast aside all such Biblical announcements as delusions or impostures. Of course he does this without conscience, for wherever the Biblical teaching contravenes his theory, he simply throws the Biblical teaching incontinently overboard. Note, too, how disrespectfully he speaks of some portions of the religion of Israel as "defunct moral crudities." No wonder, for afterward he surely does represent the Old Testament morality as woefully distorted. His fling at orthodoxy consists in his saying: "The usual procedure has been to embalm those moral crudities." That is scorn, not argument. Conservative scholars embalm no moral crudities. They teach that God adapted both His revelation and His leading to the unfolding mental and moral capacities of His people during their progressive development.

In the author's "Introduction" he says: "Two views of the Old Testament still contend for mastery among the adherents of Christianity. The one regards it as a sort of talisman, miraculously given and divinely authoritative on the subject of God, religion and morals in every part. The other regards it as a growth, in which the moral sanctions in each stage of development were succeeded and displaced by the next higher one."

Let us pause a moment to consider this. Wherever the author can use a word to cast discredit on the conservative view he does not fail to do so. Note the word talisman above. Did men like Keil, Hengstenberg, Orr, Cave and Green look upon the Bible as a sort of "talisman"? Is it to be supposed that all the living evangelical theologians and ministers and scholarly laymen in our evan-

gelical churches use the Bible in that way? No; every one should know, if every one does not, that they see nothing magical in the Bible, nor do they use it for purposes of superstition. They regard it as a special divine revelation—one that the good and holy God gave to mankind for their enlightenment in the way of salvation. To impute superstition to such people is to advertise one's lack of acquaintance with them. He also girds at the view that the Old Testament was "miraculously given and divinely authoritative." Well, that is what the Book claims for itself. If its claim from beginning to end is put on a false basis, why does not Dr. Bade simply come out as an infidel like Voltaire, Paine or Ingersoll, and reject it *in toto*. Why stand up for a Book that is fundamentally false throughout?

This author will not tolerate the view that any part of the Old Testament was given by direct divine revelation and inspiration. No, it is a "growth," a "human growth," a "development of human thought." Let us quote (page 18 of the "Introduction") : "With respect to much in Hebrew religion the student has done his full duty when he has traced its origin and assigned it a place in the development of human thought. There are intellectual conceptions, moral ideals, motives and rites, which, in spite of their divine sanctions, have fortunately forever fallen below our moral horizon." Page 19: "Since religion in primitive times was not a body of abstract beliefs, but concretely a part of almost all that we would class as general culture in the form of tribal institutions and customs, and since primitive culture undeniably has, by a long process of evolution developed into modern civilization, it follows inevitably that religion has shared this process of progressive development. It passed by stages from the crudest expressions of religious instinct, in nature, ancestor and fetish worship, to the exalted form in which it has expressed itself in the teachings of Jesus." Page 20: "No less is the history of morality in Hebrew religion a history of human growth, which exhibits, on the one hand, a process in man; on the other, a progress in idea and institution. The process is the growing fitness of the vehicle of

revelation. The progress is the growing moral perfection of the religion. Needless to say, the conception of revelation that underlies this study regards it as an illumination from within, not as a communication from without; as an educative, not an instructional, process." On page 21 he regards the literary analysis of the partition critics as having settled the dates of the various books of the Old Testament and also the view of their composite character. Then he adds: "This knowledge naturally has become the basis for a reinterpretation of Hebrew morals and religion in terms of development."

On pages 12 and 13 the author gives his ideas of revelation. He quotes Trench's definition, which is as follows: "God's revelation of Himself is a drawing back of the veil or curtain which concealed Him from men; not man finding out God, but God discovering Himself to man." Then Dr. Bade says: "Against the word 'revelation' so understood we wish to enter an early protest. Thoughtful men everywhere are abandoning this old conception, which came in as a correlate to the transcendent idea of God, and to a world-view that has been outgrown. A God apart from the world was necessarily believed to reveal Himself from without, objectively.... It is a different world of thought in which men are now living.... The change from transcendence to immanence in our thought of God has involved the corresponding transition from an objective to a subjective theory of revelation.... Not through the medium of external agencies, but in and through personality does God reveal Himself to men."

Enough quotations have been given to show how utterly the author is committed to the theory of evolution, and that to him the idea of a direct divine revelation is intolerable. What is to be said respecting this hypothesis?

The first thing we note is that the whole Old Testament history must be manipulated, reversed and reconstructed to suit the theory. Instead of accepting the history as it stands in the Bible, as tradition has believed it to be through all the centuries, and as Josephus substantially narrated it, with Genesis leading and the rest of the books

following in the natural order to make a consecutive narrative, Dr. Bade, following the dissecting critics, turns the whole history about. Of Moses (1300-1200 B. C.) there are "no authentic literary remains" (page 22 of the Introduction). "Probably few Old Testament scholars would now venture to claim a genuinely Mosaic origin for even the smallest literary fragments of the Pentateuch" (page 18). "Early traditions and songs" are assigned to 1200 to 1000 B. C., and these fragments are part of the song of Deborah, David's lament of over Saul, parts of Jacob's blessing, Jotham's fable, and the speeches of Balaam. The J document, consisting of "materials scattered through the Pentateuch and Joshua," was written in 850; the E document is dated 750 B. C.; Amos, Hosea, Isaiah (Chapters 1-39) and J and E compiled into a single document, 650; Micah comes next; D (Deuteronomy), *circa* 650-621; JE combined with D, 560; P (Priest code), 550-450; Pentateuch completed (JEDP) 420; Daniel 165; Esther 150. We have given only a part of this critical program, for the author assigns to each book of the Old Testament what he regards as its proper place.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the whole Old Testament history is transposed. Instead of treating it as it stands in the Bible, each event falling in its proper place in consecutive historical order, he splits up the narrative, assigning one section or paragraph to one date and another to another date perhaps centuries later. The whole Biblical narrative is thus treated as if it were a mosaic, a hodgpodge, instead of an organism. Is there in all the world another piece of history or literature that has been composed in this way? What would we think of an author who would accord such treatment to the history of Egypt, Greece, Rome or Mohammedanism? And why is all this confusion wrought in the Biblical history? Solely in the interest of the author's pet theory of evolution. According to that theory, the exalted teaching about God in the opening chapter of Genesis, His unity, His creation of the universe, etc., could not have been conceived in the primitive times; therefore that narrative must be brought down to a late date in order to fit into the evolu-

tionary program. Is that historical criticism? Is it not rather manipulating the historical data so as to make it fit into a preconceived and subjective theory? Whatever may be said of this method, it is not scientific, for the inductive method, which is the scientific method, first takes into account all the facts as it finds them, and then formulates its theory. We accuse Dr. Bade, and the whole Wellhausen school to which he belongs, of using the *a priori* method, in spite of all their pretensions to using the inductive or *a posteriori* method. It is a clear case of what the Greeks would have called a *hysteron proteron*—of putting the conclusion before the premises.

We wish here to emphasize the fact that Dr. Bade's mode of treatment means a decisive rejection of the testimony of the Bible itself. He will not have it that God ever directly manifested Himself to any of the Old Testament characters. Everything, according to Bade, is simply the evolution of subjective human ideas. If God ever made any revelation of Himself or His will, He did it merely through the imperfect subjective impressions of men, who made many mistakes of a very serious nature. By the way, that would be a queer kind of divine revelation! But what is the testimony of the Bible on this point? Does it teach that God revealed Himself directly or only by means of subjective experiences? Every Bible reader will tell you the former. The Bible says God spoke directly to Adam and Eve, to Cain, to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Samuel, and all the prophets. If there is anything plain and outstanding in the Bible, it is that God gave special objective revelations of Himself at intervals throughout the whole Old Testament history.

"Oh! but that is all a mistake of the writers of the various documents!" asserts the critic. "Either they credulously accepted the traditions and myths of the primitive times or else they purposely colored the narratives."

All right, then. That indicates the precise position of the critic. He pointedly rejects the explicit testimony of the Bible. His quarrel, then, is with the Bible. Why

not just come out and say so? Why turn upon orthodox theologians, as if they were responsible for putting the Bible in its present form? Whether such a critic has the truth on his side or not, he ought to be classified as an unbeliever rather than as an evangelical theologian.

However, what is the bearing of the critic's own theory on the doctrine of evolution? It eviscerates it, and for this reason: Suppose, as the critic maintains, the view of a direct revelation of God belongs to a very crude and primitive age, the age of mythology; and suppose, again, that the Pentateuch was not completed until *circa* 420 B. C.; then we want to ask why, in the name of reason and common sense, the advanced editors, whoever they were, did not eliminate the narratives of direct revelations and miracles, and tell the people that the whole history of the world and of Israel was merely the result of "the development of human thought?" Either they knew that the history they were giving the people was untrue, or they did not know it. If they thought they were writing the truth, when it was not the truth, what becomes of the theory of evolution? At so late a date evolution should have had a more enlightening effect upon them. Instead of that, they actually thought they were reciting a true narrative of God's direct revelations to His people. If they knew that the traditional belief was not true, they imposed a mendacious history and world-view upon their fellow-Jews; and the people accepted their representation as a special revelation from God! Again we ask why evolution did not clear the minds of the people at so late a date as 420 B. C. of those simple and primitive ideas of a God who made a direct revelation? Surely evolution proved itself to be a very deficient teacher. But that is not all. Even in the time of Christ the Jews, and Christ Himself, believed that the Old Testament contains a true narrative of a special divine revelation. And even to-day there are millions of Jews and Christians who hold firmly to the view of a special divine revelation in the Old Testament. If this is all that evolution can do, its effectiveness is surely very questionable.

Yet it is on account of this very theory of evolution that the critics assign most of the Old Testament composition to a late date, so that they can give development plenty of time to develop! We insist on knowing why the editors and redactors of 600-420 B. C. did not construct the history and religion of the Pentateuch and the other Biblical books prior to their time according to the theory of evolution instead of according to the primitive and traditional view. We will tell you just why: The theory of evolution is not the true view. It is illogical. It is built on the wrong foundation. It is based on false premises and *non sequitur* modes of reasoning.

Now, this is the main proposition to be proved—that evolution is a futile theory, is not adequate to its task, and is disproved by history, science and religion. Suppose we look at the history of nations. Go back in the annals of almost all the nations of the earth—those that have any annals and have left any archaeological remains—and what do you find? Evidences of a high civilization. Note what is being found in Egypt, Babylonia, Palestine, Greece, Rome. Pyramids, palaces, aqueducts, towers, monuments, cuneiform tablets, legal codes—all these bear testimony that nations long before the historic period began outside of the Bible were wonderfully advanced in the arts of enlightenment. Even in Turkestan recent explorations have unearthed the remains of great cities, with their telltale evidences of a marvellous ancient civilization. The same kind of discoveries have been made among the ruins of the Aztecs of Mexico, the Toltecs of Central America and the Incas of Peru. Some of us can remember how Wendell Phillips was wont to thrill us with his lecture on "The Lost Arts." Some of the arts of these ancient civilizations are "lost" even to the present day. Therefore we maintain that the story of nations, so far as it can be traced by both history and archeology, does not point to a period of primeval savagery, but the reverse. And that fact invalidates the theory of evolution.

The like is true of the history of religion. It is a well known fact, brought out by Max Muller, Orr, and many

other writers, that the further back you trace most of the ethnic religions, the more nearly they approach to pure monotheism. The discovery of the Egyptian "Book of the Dead," the most ancient bit of Egyptian literature yet found, corroborates this statement, for it shows that the most ancient ritual of that nation asserted the view of only one God. A similar claim can be upheld for the religions of India, China and Persia. The evolutionists often aver that the primitive religion of mankind was fetichism or animism. This cannot be proved. There is *not one example* on record of a nation that has evolved by its own efforts from animism through polytheism to monotheism. On this point we quote from Principal Fairbairn, who, in speaking of the evolutionists, says: "They assume a theory of development that has not a single historical instance to verify it. Examples are wanted of people who have grown, without foreign influence, from atheism to Fetichism, and from it through the intermediate stages into Monotheism; and until such examples be given, hypotheses claiming to be 'Natural Histories of Religion' must be judged as hypotheses still."

(*"Studies in the Philosophy of Religion,"* p. 12.)

Here is also a relevant passage from Dr. James Orr's "*The Christian View of God and the World,*" page 75: "Volkmar has remarked that of monotheistic religions there are only three in the world—the Israelitish, the Christian and the Mohammedan; and the last named is derived from the other two... This limitation of Monotheism in religion to the peoples who have benefitted by the Biblical teaching on this subject suggests its origin from a higher than human source; and refutes the contention of those who would persuade us that the monotheistic idea is the result of a long process of development through which the race necessarily passes, beginning with Fetichism, or perhaps Ghost-worship, mounting to Polytheism, and ultimately subsuming the multitude of divine powers under one all-controlling will. It will be time enough to accept this theory when, outside the line of the Biblical development, a single nation can be pointed to which has gone through these stages and reached this

goal." We would also refer the reader to Dr. Orr's pertinent notes on pages 409-414; also to Dr. Tisdall's two scholarly books, "Christianity and Other Faiths" and "Comparative Religion"; Valentine's "Natural Theology" is very good on this thesis.

Let us look at the facts without prejudice. There is plenty of evidence in history and archeology of the degeneration of both civilization and religion. The decay and disappearance of nations afford abundant proof. There is not one instance of any people advancing by its own efforts from the lower forms of religion to the higher. On the other hand, the evidence all points to the fact that the further back we pursue our historical study of religions, the more nearly they approach the monotheistic conception. These things being true, what is the most adequate theory to account for all the facts? It would be that the original idea of God was Monotheism, and that the lower and baser religious conceptions are decadent forms. We do not need to have the Bible to prove that sin, superstition and spiritual darkness are in the world, and these would account for the human tendency to degeneration in religion. At all events, such a tendency is an outstanding empirical fact. Even in Christian lands there are periods of religious decline. All forms and ideas, however pure at first, are liable to become perverted and perfunctory. By simply accepting facts as we find them in all the world, we see that the conception of primitive monotheism and the tendency to deterioration afford the most adequate theory. And with this empirical fact the teaching of the Bible agrees fully. In the beginning God revealed Himself as the one true God; but sin came into the world, and men degenerated, and fell into lower and lower forms of superstition. To this tendency to idolatry the Jews were also subject, and it was only by special revelations of Himself that God was able to keep alive in the world the true original monotheistic religion. Here is a view that is adequate, that tallies with the facts, and that therefore is the only scientific hypothesis.

In the next place, we will proceed to convict Dr. Bade

out of his writings of disloyalty to his own theory of evolution. He calls Amos and Hosea "pioneers of a new era" and Isaiah (Chapters 1-39) "the prophet of holiness." The first two came very near, at times at least, to preaching true monotheism, and both they and Isaiah proclaimed a very high type of morality. Of course, according to the modern critic, they had not thrown off the shackles entirely; yet they were comparatively free from the monolatry and ritualism of the rest of the Jews. Now note: According to Bade, Amos and Hosea prophesied 750-735 B. C. and Isaiah 740-700. However, the Priests' Code (P), including Leviticus, etc., was not written until 550-450—that is, from 200 to 300 years after the prophets named above. Yet the Priest's Code was a reversion to the ritualism that had been so severely condemned by those prophets! Here, according to Bade himself, there was deterioration instead of evolution.

In another way our critic invalidates his development theory. He holds that the later prophets got away from the idea of a direct revelation of God, and held to the view which Bade himself champions, namely, that God operates only immanently through the conceptions of men. Well, those prophets wrote from 750 to 460 B. C. (*circa*, of course, for everything is guess work). But, lo and behold! the Pentateuch was not completed until (*circa*) 420 B. C., 40 years after the last of the prophets. And now these final editors and redactors of the Pentateuch, writing nearly a half century after the last of the prophets and more than three centuries after the first, did not construct it according to the high ideals of immanent revelation held by the prophets, but actually throughout the whole book represented God as given direct and objective manifestations. Worse yet for the theory of evolution, the conceptions of the Pentateuchal redactors prevailed in Israel. Here is surely an acute case of degeneration. According to Bade's own representation, therefore, the evolution theory did not work in the history of the Israelitish nation.

Bade also argues that Amos and Hosea came very near teaching pure monotheism, and denounced the narrow

Jahvism (the idea that Jehovah was only a national god) of the Israelites prior to that time. But these prophets flourished 750-735 B. C. Two hundred years later the Priests' Code was written, and was accepted by Israel; yet this code inculcated the old crude Jahvism or mono-latry instead of the advanced theism of the prophets. Another case of reversion instead of evolution. If evolution does not serve the disintegrating critics better than this, what advantage has it over the evangelical view?

But we convict our author once more out of his own book of being untrue to his favorite hypothesis. On pages 7-10 he tries to prove that Christ Himself was a critic of the Old Testament, rejecting portions of its teaching, and substituting a higher and truer view. We think he misrepresents Christ here, but that is not the point just now. Then on page 10 Dr. Bade adds: "Passing on to the apostles, one finds, strangely enough, that they narrowed the scope of criticism, if they did not deny it altogether. They apparently accepted the moral criticism applied to the Old Testament by Jesus, but they also believed in the literal inspiration of the text. A thorough comprehension and acceptance of Jesus' principles would have prevented the apostles from binding themselves and their converts once more to the letter of the Jewish Scriptures. They did not, could not, fully comprehend." That is, here again evolution would not work. It should have enabled the apostles to go right forward developing Christ's higher critical ideas and principles. Instead of evolution, there was reversion here once more. The apostles went back to the Old Testament conception of an objective revelation instead of the nebulous "immanent" unfolding of "human thought." The apostles should not have been so stubborn. More than that, they proved Christ (whom Bade seems to want to accept as a true teacher) to be a false prophet, for He promised that the Holy Spirit would "lead them into all truth." Why did not the immanent Spirit of God lead them immanently in the right and the promised way, the all-prevailing way of evolution? Even the Holy Spirit became obstinate!

We have shown that the history of nations, their civili-

zations and religions disprove the hypothesis of evolution. So does human biography. Here we need not take the Bible as our guide, but need only to glance at the pages of secular history. In Greece most of the truly great men came too soon for the theory of evolution. Homer, who flourished about 1000 B. C., had no contemporaries or successors who were his equals in epic poetry. He should have been obliging enough to wait for evolution to develop him at the proper psychological moment. And there are Pericles, the greatest in statesmanship, Euripides, in tragic poetry, Phidias, in sculpture, Demosthenes, in oratory, and that triumvirate of philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle—all of them came prematurely, and so do not fit into the evolution hypothesis; for they were born, lived, wrought and died, without leaving successors who were their equals. The same may be said of Rome with her Cicero, Seneca and Marcus Aurelius. Other nations gave the world its Shakespeare, Milton, Goethe, Schiller, Washington and Lincoln long before the strategic moment had come to prove the pet theory of the day to be a verified hypothesis. Human history is a rather recalcitrant pupil in the school of evolution.

It is interesting to note that Biblical history follows in this respect the same regime as secular history. Here and there recur conspicuous characters as beacon lights for the rest of the world, standing almost alone in the sphere of spirituality—Enoch, Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah; then in the New Testament Christ came “in the fullness of time” according to the divine plan, but, if evolution is true, very much out of season. In this respect Biblical and secular history coincide—they do not display a uniform progressive process, but exhibit individuals who stand head and shoulders above their contemporaries and describe alternating periods of civil and religious advance and decline.

Thus we think we have shown that the religion of Israel cannot be accounted for on the theory of mere psychological evolution. That hypothesis is not adequate, and is therefore unscientific. If evolution must be given

up, what view shall we accept? We know of only one view that is adequate, and that is, the Bible is a divine revelation, as it claims to be. Since evolution has proved itself insufficient, it is no longer necessary to rearrange the books of the Old Testament or reconstruct its history, but we can simply let everything stand as we find it in the Bible.

Suppose now, instead of being atomistic and picayunish in our criticism, we take the large, the comprehensive view of the Biblical system as a *Weltanschauung*, and see whether it is not rational, and at the same time so wonderful a scheme as to afford a presumption that it must be an especially revealed plan. First, there is the idea of God as the personal Creator as set forth in the first and second chapters of Genesis. How marvellous it is that any one living in that remote age should be able to get such a conception! There is not another cosmogony in the world that begins with God as a personal Being and the Creator of the cosmos. All heathen cosmogonies represent the gods as coming from the world or the primordial impersonal essence of things. How does it happen that the Bible alone of all ancient books gives us this clear monotheistic conception, and the view of God as the Creator? Even the wisest philosophers of Greece and Rome did not rise to this exalted conception. The only sufficient way to account for the amazing fact is that God Himself revealed the truth to some one; and that is what the Bible teaches.

The creation of man in the divine image is another wonderful idea that man could not have discovered by his own thinking. Remarkable, too, is the conception that he was created a free moral agent, with power to choose between good and evil. Here is an ethical view of man that will account for all the facts of history. When man fell into sin by his own volition, what human ingenuity could have devised or discovered a plan by which he might be rescued by divine love and mercy, without setting aside and dishonoring the divine and eternal law of justice. Yet we find all the Old Testament history and symbolism leading up to "the fullness of time" when God sent His

Son, "born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law." Thus, according to this profound world-view, God was "able to be just and the justifier of every one that believeth on His Son." The Old Testament begins with Paradise formed and lost; the New Testament ends with Paradise restored and regained. So the Bible is all one great unified plan, comprehending all facts, all needs, all aspirations, all moral and spiritual imperatives. Could so marvelous and profound a scheme ever have been the mere evolution of human thinking? We do not believe it. It has been divinely revealed. In this connection we would re-echo the inspired conception of the prophet (Isa. 55:8, 9): "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

ARTICLE IX.

THE SCOPE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

BY CHARLES WILLIAM HEATHCOTE, A.M., S.T.D.

THE DEFINITION.

Dr. Coe says the factors involved in the idea of education are these: "An immature being, a goal or destiny for life, and older human beings who can help the younger to realize this goal or destiny."¹ Dr. Coe also shows that at times, particularly in the past, educators over-emphasized the adult viewpoint. In other words, so much stress was laid upon adult experiences that these results became the standards of education. Adult views are necessary for educational development, but to lay undue emphasis upon them to the exclusion of other ideas will prevent genuine progressive growth. Naturally the goal sought after under such circumstances was to over-emphasize the destiny of man. This was the view of medieval education. Religious education, then, under the control of the Church was fostered along narrow lines of development. Medieval religion as well as education were not "broad enough to include everything that is worthy of being a part of our temporal life." Religion and education alike had as their one goal the salvation of souls from eternal punishment.

Guided by these narrow ideals educators forgot to take into account the child life as one of the chief elements in the development of education. However modern educators such as Pestalozzi, Froebel and others brought out the importance of studying the child mind. They recognized the fact that for education to accomplish the most for mankind it must be cognizant of the laws and experiences of childhood as well as of the adult life. Education is a progressive development in which the whole personality is involved.

1 Education in Religion and Morals—pp. 11 and 12.

During the last few years so much has been written about the importance of child study that it has been over-emphasized. It has resulted in a tendency to lose sight of the real purpose of child education. At the present time we note a change coming in the educational world. The study of child life is coming to its proper place and sphere.

In view of this discussion the question arises, what is education? It will be in order to give the opinion of several prominent educators.

Education is the sum of the reflective efforts by which we aid nature in the development of the physical, intellectual and moral faculties of man, in view of his perfection, his happiness and his social destination.—J. G. Compayre, *Lectures on Pedagogy* (Boston 1893) pages 126.

"To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge."—Herbert Spencer, *Education*.

"If education cannot be identified with mere instruction, what is it? What does the term mean? I answer, it must mean a gradual adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the race."—Butler, *The Meaning of Education*, page 17.

"The true end of teaching is one with the true aim of life; and each lesson must be presented with the conscious purpose of making the most out of the life of the one taught."—Arnold Tompkins—*The Philosophy of Teaching*, page 71.

"Education, in short, cannot be better described than by calling it the organization of acquired habits of conduct and tendencies to behavior."—William James, *Talks to Teachers*, page 29.

These definitions which we have quoted give the viewpoint of education in general. Present day educational principles are the outgrowth of the development of the progress of the world in the past. Present and past achievements for the truth lay the foundations for the future. History shows that educational progress has advanced along two great lines,—the psychological and sociological. The basic is the psychological side. The child

mind and not the adult forms the basis of educational principles. The Master Teacher showed this significant fact when he said "Suffer the little children to come unto me." As has already been mentioned, it remained for modern educators and religionists to readjust the psychology of education to the ideal of the Master. The child has his distinctive tendencies, experiences, etc., which must be studied and understood and educated, if later, as a man, he is to do his part in perpetuating the ideals of Christian civilization.

The sociological side of education is an off-shoot of the psychological. The social side of the child nature is an inheritance of the tendencies of the past, both primitive and civilized. The sociological part of education is a work for the present and the future. The instinctive tendencies of the child life are to be trained and developed so that they may be adapted to the best physical environment and civilizing elements. On this point Butler says: "Natural forces play no small part in adapting human beings to both elements (physical and civilized) of environment, but the process of education is especially potent as regards adaptation to the second element, civilization. Civilization—man's spiritual environment, all his surroundings which are not directly physical—this it is which has to be conquered, in its elements at least before one can attain a true education."²

The two great historic elements education and the Christian religion have fostered, developed, and given to us our present day civilization. Dr. Butler has well said that the child born into the present day civilization comes into a five-fold inheritance bequeathed to him by the past and for him to be truly educated he must have a knowledge of each one of these elements, as well as insight into them all and sympathy with them all.

The summary of his classification is as follows:³

(1). The scientific inheritance, by which man is entitled to know and understand nature by utilizing all the

² Principles of Religious Education—p. 5.

³ The Meaning of Education—Butler—pp. 17-34.

resources of modern scientific method. He is entitled to know about the world from the viewpoint of the earlier peoples and what is ours today. It is the basis of a liberal education.

(2). The literary inheritance. The great literary treasures and storehouses of culture of the past are to be mastered through the study of language. Literature shows the progressive development of the peoples of the world which can only be understood and interpreted by the study of language. Though important as is the study of this great literary inheritance yet it narrows education to say this study alone is sufficient. It is to go hand in hand with the scientific inheritance in the early life of the child, during the period of plasticity or education.

(3). The aesthetic inheritance. The aesthetic spirit which engenders the feeling for the beautiful and the sublime history shows it occupied a prominent phase in the early history of the human race. It was developed and fostered by the Greeks. Later narrow religious ideals sought to suppress all feelings for the beautiful. But it was impossible. Ideals of art and beauty were given expression in the construction of Gothic cathedrals and the pictures of the painters of the Renaissance. The importance of aesthetic training is recognized to-day as one of the factors in giving the child a true education and perpetuating the ideals of civilization.

(4). The institutional inheritance. The history of the world shows three types of political ideals. The one which shows the individual to be of no importance, but only the great mass of the people are to be considered, that is individuality must be pressed down for the advantage of the whole. Then there is the type which is shown in extreme individualism which will not take into consideration the welfare of society as a whole but seeks to make the individual sufficient unto himself. The true type is neither extreme. It gives individuality worth, place and consideration, but makes it subservient, and responsible to law, the welfare of society and existing institutions. This is the type which our children are to follow if our civilization of the future is to grow and develop.

(5). The religious inheritance. Religion in some form or another is common alike to both primitive and civilized people. History of the past testifies to this fact as well as at the present time. The religious inheritance of the race is a rich one. This is true particularly of Christianity in the ideals it has contributed to the advancement of civilization and culture. Religion always played a prominent part in education though sometimes its spirit was narrow, illiberal and uninformed. Events of comparative recent times have resulted in the separation of religion from education.

The growth of the public school system in the United States has witnessed the divorce of all religious instruction from the schools. The result is our present plan of educational development is not meeting adequately the needs of the child.

Since the importance of religious education is generally recognized it is fitting that we should define it. *The ideal of religious education is the development of the highest form of individual character which is to be interpreted in terms of unselfish service for God and mankind.*

When the Master gave the command "Go ye forth and teach," Matt. 28:19-20, He laid stress upon a great educational truth. His own life and mission exemplified this educational ideal. He impressed this message upon his disciples and finally upon his followers to teach. What was the basis of His teaching? Unselfish service for God and fellowman. This is the central truth of Christianity. It is based upon the highest form of character moulded in spirit and in truth after the life of the perfect Teacher. "Character," says J. S. Mill, "is a completely fashioned will." James defines it as a "huddle of habits." The definition as stated by James sets forth the idea we have in mind which we have set forth in our definition of religious education, namely,—the habit of service which comes through training every tendency of the individual personality which shall find expression in unselfish service for God and men. "No matter how full a reservoir of *maxims* we may possess, no matter how good one's *sentiments* may be, if we have not taken advantage of every concrete

opportunity to *act* one's character may remain entirely unaffected for the better."⁴ The key note of religious education is to develop the highest form of individual character which will seek active expression in the form of unselfish service.

RELIGION AND EDUCATION.

In theory religion and education may be separated from each other, but in reality such a thought is impossible. The aim and goal of education and religion are virtually the same. The basis of true education is religion and any effort to make education independent of religion narrows its scope, aim and goal. True education seeks to develop the whole personality. This is the ideal which education must ever have before it and to which it must tenaciously hold. The religious ideal is also concerned in the whole personality. Every volitional, emotional and intellectual tendency it is to touch, develop and bring out to the highest possible form. No child who has lacked a careful and thorough training in education and religion upon reaching maturity can be expected to do his full duty to God, his fellowman and to himself. Dr. King has aptly written: "The highest conceivable culture, therefore, would be the culture that should enable a man to enter with appreciation and conviction with the deepest and most significant personal life of history; and the world is coming to see with greater clearness every day that that life is the life of Jesus Christ."⁵

THE FACTORS.

There are three important educational factors which help to give the child that true instruction for him to do his full duty in life, i. e., (1) the school; (2) the home; (3) the Church.

4 Psychology. James, Vol. I—p. 125.

5 Personal and Ideal Elements In Education—p. 78.

THE SCHOOL.

According to the interpretation of our constitution, religion cannot be taught in our public schools. In the United States, Church and State are separate and independent of each other, but yet a reciprocal relation exists between them. We have already written about the supreme importance and spheres of religion in order to make up an all round and efficient education. There is but one conclusion to reach with respect to our public schools which leads us to say that its educational work, therefore, is inadequately incomplete.

We recognize the importance of reading the Bible in the schools, but we cannot call this exercise a religious instruction nor would we want it designated by such a term. Where this reading is done with discrimination and without comment on the choice and splendid portions of Scriptures, which should always be read, we believe great good can be accomplished in many ways. This reading may not be instructive in the analytic sense, but the mind of the pupil is impressed with the beauty and simplicity of God's Word and we sincerely believe a thirst will be awakened in the heart of the child for a greater knowledge of the Word.

There are many educators and religionists who advocate the study of religion in the public schools. They make a contradistinction between teaching religion and denominationalism. They advocate that religious instruction based on board general terms of religious concepts free from doctrinal, creedal and denominational interpretations could be put into the school curriculum. We realize there is much force and consideration given to their argument but we cannot see the feasibility of the plan. We believe in the broad interpretation of religion for it to be thoroughly adaptable to all classes and conditions of humanity. When we speak of religion we are of course referring to the broad principles of Christianity upon which the advocates of this theory agree as it is the only religion which can give a positive civilization to the

world. We do not believe that the introduction of religious instruction even on the basis of the broadest interpretation of Christian teachings would work out in practice. It is very evident such a plan would not be acceptable to the Hebrew, Catholic and a large majority of the Protestants and many other forms of religious life which are represented in our public schools. All these conditions must be borne in mind in advocating this theory. At the same time it is well nigh impossible to interpret religion on the broadest basis to eliminate every iota of denominational and doctrinal viewpoint. The public school is not a religious nor an anti-religious school, but it is a secular institution and we want to see it remain as such. We want to see it give the best instruction possible so that our children become well educated along scientific, literary, aesthetic and institutional lines.

We recognize that there is considerable weight in the proposition which is set forth in citing the German schools as an example where an excellent and practical course of religious instruction obtains. We have every reason to expect this condition of affairs there. The German people are the inheritors of the great Lutheran movement and Luther was a staunch champion and advocate of religious education in the schools. Such splendid opportunities are afforded in Germany for the advancement of religious instruction that we have every reason to expect such instruction to be given which shall be the best. Since the Lutheran faith is the state church of Germany these measures of religious instruction have the support of the Government. In the United States such conditions do not obtain. Nor would we want them to exist. We realize the supreme necessity of having the Church and the dependence of the Government upon the Church, but we would not want some particular denomination to be the state church. American ideals and conceptions of religious and civil liberty and democracy show these principles are foreign to our viewpoint.

We agree with many educators that the Bible should be placed in our public schools to be studied as *literature*,

history, and morals. But let it be stated here that the study of the Bible thus is not religious instruction and the Bible to be studied along the three lines suggested must be confined to the basic fundamentals of these subjects. We think the Bible from this viewpoint should find a place in our schools. It is the general verdict of all peoples who know about the Bible that it is the repository of the world's sublimest literature! If the study of the Koran, Hindu writings, Milton, Lamb's Tales, etc., may find a place in our school curriculum, if the teacher so desires, why should the historical study of Joshua, a literary study of the Psalms or a study of the moral precepts of the Pauline epistles be forbidden? We cannot see any sane reason for their omission.

Dr. Seeley in his charmingly written book says: "I believe that our teachers should have larger right of way to emphasize the importance of these virtues, (i. e., honesty, sobriety, etc.), so that with the culture and furnishing of the intellect, there shall come the development of the individual along moral lines, of religious lines, if you please, and yet not in a sectarian way. Our teachers and superintendents, as a rule, are Christian men and women, and there go out indirectly in their lives influences in this direction."⁶

However, we cannot agree with Dr. Seeley in advocating the study of the Bible as a religious book. For the reason previously stated and also by way of the following example. The Hebrew father would have every right to object according to his religious beliefs and traditions for the principles of the Christian religion being taught the child. The Bible is broad and big enough in its wonderful work to teach the highest form of morals without touching upon its religious precepts. Again we say religion cannot be consistently taught in our public schools. However the two great factors which are to teach our children religious truths are the Home and the Church.

6 Foundations of Education—Seeley—p. 248.

THE HOME.

The home is the first and always should remain the most important factor in a child's education. This training should extend from the early years of childhood to manhood. The ancient Hebrews recognized the supreme importance of home instruction and they earnestly tried to bring up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord. When this ideal was earnestly adhered to peace, joy, and prosperity crowned the people of Israel. In this respect the ancient Hebrew people will always be an example for the present and future generations.

The home is the basic unit of society. It is such an important institution that great emphasis needs to be laid upon the instruction of Biblical truths therein. Alas in too many of our homes the Bible is a closed Book and religious instruction is never given at all. No parent can expect the school and the Church to give all the education the child needs. Too many parents seek to shift all of the training of their children upon the Church and the school. This is impossible. These two important educational factors can never give training to a child which is expected to come from the hearth stone. Time and their specialized organization make it impossible.

There should always be the closest co-operation between the home and the school and the Church. The parents should take a hearty interest in the daily school tasks of their children and whatever home work may be required by the school authorities, they should see that their children perform their tasks faithfully and well. By this close co-operation the efficiency of the public schools would be increased.

The home should also co-operate more earnestly with the Church and give it better support and see that the children attend the sessions of the Sunday School regularly and faithfully. Too many parents think it is the duty alone of the pastor and the Bible School teacher to see that their children attend the Church worship and sessions of the Bible School. They are frequently met with the statement on the part of the parent as was a

Bible School teacher who once visited a home to see that one of the daughters attended her Bible School class more regularly when the mother said to the teacher: "It was her duty to see that her daughter attended regularly." We agree that it is the duty of pastors and teachers to see that the children come regularly but it is not their whole nor first duty, for this rests upon the home.

The home, therefore, remains the first important factor in the religious education of the child life.

THE CHURCH.

The importance of the Church to a community is well recognized. No community could exist without it. The Church particularly through the Bible School is the second important factor for religious education. A great responsibility rests upon the Bible School and it is a much needed part of our educational work to-day. For it to do the work of religious education which is in large measure incumbent upon it, it must be efficiently organized and utilize the best methods for it to attain the purpose of its organization.

The Bible School must work in the closest co-operation with the public school because upon it mostly devolves the task of teaching the child religious principles which the public school does not.

The Bible School needs to be thoroughly and systematically organized. Its curriculum needs to be placed on a scientific and analytic basis if efficient instruction is to be given. Its teachings must be adaptable to child life with a knowledge of the capacities and needs of the child. The school, it must be remembered, is not only to teach religion as such *per se* but its curriculum should correlate as closely as possible with the public school teaching. In other words, Biblical history, geography, biography, literature, art and precepts should be carefully taught. As in the public schools, there needs to be careful and systematic grading of the classes, so that the teaching of these studies may be adaptable to the capacities of the children.

The teachers need to be trained and thoroughly prepared to carry on their work. Bible School teaching, like

public school teaching, requires training to be thoroughly done. In order that the work of the Bible School may be advanced, there needs to be closest co-operation between the home and the school.

It is necessary if the school is to be efficient in teaching the children of the household. The spirit of co-operation between the two must be very close in order to secure regular attendance upon the Bible School. This is one of the difficult problems which we face at present. Attendance upon the public school is compulsory. Not so with the Bible School. The attendance there is often irregular on the part of a large number of the children and under present conditions an exceedingly large number of children are not receiving religious instruction. However, we believe this problem can be reduced to a minimum or overcome entirely by close co-operation of Bible School and home. Perhaps a suggestion on this point would be in order which we believe could be worked out along practical lines if the Bible School would employ a trained and paid Secretary for this work, or if a number of churches in the city or town would group together to meet the expense, and it would be his duty to come in contact with each home and get the children to go to the school of their denomination. Appeals to the responsibility of parents will be the only way the children can ever be brought into the Sunday School.

We believe, too, that the study period for the Bible School lesson should cover a period of at least one hour instead of half an hour. The lesson period may be made so interesting and inspiring on the part of a trained teacher that there would be no difficulty experienced on this point. We believe it would be feasible for each child to do a little homework on various exercises which could be reported to the teacher the following Sunday. This work could be of such a nature as not to interfere with the public school work. In any event we see the need and importance of religious education and the work of carrying it on devolves upon the Bible School. This great institution we want to make more efficient in every way possible.

*Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

ARTICLE X.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

In the *Methodist Review* (July-Aug.) Professor Irwin R. Beiler of Baker University, Kans., in writing about "The Christian Religion and the Scientific Method" protests against the reduction of Christian experience to a scientific formula. He believes that to attempt to do this would expose it to the following dangers:

1. The formulation of a science of religious experience would tend to make it mechanical. Codification, whether of the moral ideas of Confucius, the moral laws of Moses, or the teaching of Jesus as in mediaeval times, has always resulted in formalism, the destruction of the spirit and the deification of the letter. Formulated prayers have become magical incantations. The Mosaic law and its Rabbinic additions had become God and religion to the Hebrews of Jesus' day. God was a judge who spent part of his time studying the law. Illustrations could be multiplied to show that whenever religious life condenses to the codified it has little or no interest in the individual; that whenever its essence is expressed in its external form, be it code or ceremony, it tends to become lifeless and to lose its power over the human heart. What reason have we to believe that the formulation of a science of the religious experience, valid for all, would be an exception to the history of its kind?

2. That truth tends to become petrified when systematized is true even in science. It is still truer in religion. There is value in keeping it stirred up and not allowing it to crystallize. May not the element of uncertainty about some things in our religious life be a blessing in disguise? Some would have God so physically visible in the world, and immortality so sensuously evident, that neither could be questioned by the most skeptical. Not only is there more interest in the open and unsettled, as evidenced by the effect of dogma upon the layman and

even upon the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, but more room for progress remains when questions about the facts themselves do not permit the interpretations of them to grow cold and solidify. This truth makes easier the revelation to us, sometime in the future, of those things which we were not and perhaps are not able to bear. The petrified forms of living truth, the fluid "Zeitgeist" frozen stiff whether in Palestine at the opening of the Christian era, or in the Italy of mediaeval days, or in the America of the nineteenth century, have gripped the religious as well as the intellectual life like a vise and prevented progress.

3. Finally, there is danger that all not proved will be lightly regarded. It throws the religious life especially open to attack from naturalism, which will demand that all not proved or explained be rejected. Reduce religion to the humanly rational solely, to the categories of science, if you will, and what have you left? Daniel Webster's words reach us at this point, that a religion we could completely understand would not be big enough to hold us. Reduce it to the merely scientific and this danger could not be avoided. Herrmann thinks there is, perhaps, no greater religious danger than that Christian people generally may not come to see that the great facts of religious experience are not a part of the world with which science deals, and so can no more be proved or disproved by its methods than explained by its laws and principles.

"Modern Political Oratory, and its Lessons for the Preacher" is the theme of an article by George Jackson in *The London Quarterly Review*. He writes very sensibly as follows:

The day of the pulpit is no more past than is the day of the platform, provided always that the preacher will bring to his task both honest work and utmost sincerity. He too, can "win votes," if it is the winning of votes, the response of men's souls on which his heart is set. "To the prophets," it has been finely said, "preaching was no mere display, but a sore battle with the hard hearts of their

contemporaries, in which the messenger of the Lord worked with the pity of his weakness upon him, at a supreme cost to himself and consciousness that he must summon to his desperate task every resource of feeling and of art." Such preaching has never failed. It has great allies. It has an ally, albeit often a slumbering one, in every human breast. It has an ally, "living and active" in God Himself. Such preaching cannot fail.

The attempt is sometimes made to disparge the work of the preacher by reminding us of its fleeting and impermanent character. What floods of instruction, exhortation, and appeal are poured forth every week from the pulpits of our land; and what, men ask, comes of it all? Of the countless volumes of sermons that are annually issued from the press, how many survive the years of their birth? Once or twice in a generation a great preacher arises, like John Henry Newman, or Frederick William Robertson, whose sermons take their place in our literature, but the rest vanish and are forgotten like a child's sand-castles before the advancing tide. We can count on the fingers of one hand all the books of sermons that the editor of *Everyman's Library* has thought it worth while to include in his seven hundred volumes of the world's literature. "Vanity of vanities," saith the preacher, "all is vanity"—even the preachings of the preacher himself.

But this quality of impermanence is no singularity of the preacher's work; it attaches to all human speech, to that of the politician no less than to that of the preacher. If sermons make but a poor show in *Everyman's Library*, political oratory fares no better. From Demosthenes downwards, with America thrown in to help, it can muster but seven volumes in all. Gladstone's speeches made a considerable noise in their day, but who reads them now? An enterprising publisher once ventured on an edition of them in ten volumes; I should be surprised to learn that he had ten pence for his pains. If there are any speeches in the English language that are safe against the tooth of time, they are probably those of Edmund Burke. But the significant thing is that discourses

which have been for succeeding generations a very mine of political wisdom only won for their author at the time the nickname of "the dinner bell of the House of Commons." As prose literature the speeches of Burke are imperishable; as speeches, judged in the only way that speeches can be judged, namely by their influence on those who heard them, they were generally failures. Nor is the reason far to seek. They were not real speeches at all, but political treatises which happen to have been spoken. So that Burke is no real exception to that impermanence which belongs to almost all forms of the spoken word.

An address on "Religious Advance in Fifty Years," given at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Dr. Faunce of Brown University, as reported in *The American Journal of Theology* (July), concludes as follows:

All this is heartening and inspiring. But it forces upon us an immensely serious problem. It is the success of the Christian faith which now imperils it. It is the victory of the Church which may mean its absorption. Can the Church compete with the organization itself has created? Can Christianity control the spirits it has evoked? Will the Church remain the center of hope and joy and inspiration to the struggling world? Or will it give way to the innumerable associations it has energized, to the social leaders it has inspired, to the ethical movements it has generated? Shall Christianity be devoured by its own children, or shall it show itself mightier than all its transient offspring? If it is to survive, it must refuse to change its nature. It must hold itself more sacred, more divine than any of the changing channels through which it flows. It must refuse to be dissolved into poetry, into sociology, into civic betterment, or any other partial goods. It must decline to be side-tracked into public playgrounds or cheap lodging-houses. These are its fruit, but never its roots. It must keep the soul on top. It must master the powers it has let loose on

the world. It must rise above all its varying expressions and remain, as it has been in all its most triumphant days, at once the power of God and the wisdom of God.

The Harvard Theological Review (July) has a fine appreciation of Confucianism from the pen of Edward T. Williams. The restoration of this ancient faith by the new President of China as the national religion involves many problems. The author writes:

"In view of the facts recited it seems worth while to consider what there is in Confucianism that gives it such a hold upon the affections of the Chinese people, what relation the religion sustains to their moral standards, what adaptability it shows to the needs of modern life, whether or not there are any elements in it worth preserving. Confucianism profoundly influences the life of every individual in China. As a child the Chinese is taught to bow reverently to the tablet of the sage when he enters and leaves the school room. The sacred scriptures edited by Confucius are the text-books given him to study, and these he learns by heart. The ritual prescribes the ceremonies to be observed when he attains his majority, the worship of Heaven and Earth and his ancestors when he is married, the solemn service of mourning for the dead, the offerings to be made in the hall at the winter solstice and those at the grave in the spring. As a member of the community he joins in the service at the Confucian temple at the new and the full moon and particularly at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. As an official he must worship also at the local altar to the spirits of the land and the harvest, and in the temples to the various patron saints and heroes of the State. Like other religions, Confucianism has its private and public worship; those suited to the individual, or rather the family life, and those intended for the community and the nation."

"The relation of the Confucian religion to the moral standards of the people is a very intimate one. The Confucian classics, which are the sacred books, hold ever before the Chinese student a high ideal of character. Justice, mercy, self-denial, sincerity, moral courage, filial and

fraternal affection—all these virtues are repeatedly emphasized. It aims to strengthen the three bonds of society—that is to say, those between parent and child, husband and wife and between ruler and subject. Thus it seeks to provide peace in the home and order in the State. It insists upon the worship of the spirits, but it teaches that virtuous living is a condition of acceptance with God. "The spirits are not always favorable." *The Classic of History* says: "they accept only the worship of the sincere." These scriptures teach that sickness, poverty, drought, pestilence and war are all calamities sent as a punishment for sin. They tell us that 'the ways of Shang Ti are invariable. Upon the good he bestows blessings, upon the evil-doer he sends down calamities.'

It is natural, therefore, for the Chinese to feel that the moral law finds its sanction in the national religion, and equally naturally to fear an abandonment of the national religion might lead to a deterioration in morals. When the moral standards of society are supposed to find their only sanction in religion, if that religion be abandoned, there is indeed grave danger that the less thoughtful will imagine that moral requirements have lost their authority. In such a society, unless there be stringent legislation and a strong public opinion to secure its enforcement, the individual without religion is apt to fall a prey to vice, social bonds to become relaxed, and government corrupt and efficient."

"The Effect Upon the Churches of the Social Movement" is presented in an article in *The Harvard Theological Review* (July) by Geo. F. Kenngott, who believes that the Churches are profiting by social agitation. He writes:

"The effect upon the churches of the social message of the gospel had been good as far as it has gone. The Church and its ministry, like some business men wants large and quick returns, and when the expected returns do not materialize immediately, there is a revulsion or new experiment. When the social message of the gospel has been heralded for a century in the dark places of the

earth and the Christian motive has invaded the councils of nations and sects, it will be time enough to condemn the social emphasis if it has not succeeded. Certainly the old individualistic appeal has not produced a Christian society or state. I believe in a new and social revival, different from any revival that has preceded, a revival of civic righteousness. A certain kind of socialist says, 'Let the better world come by economic law.' The Christian socialists like Maurice and Kingsley say, 'Let the better world come by law and grace.' The one force works from without, the other from within. Both should co-operate. The social question is a religious question, and all religious men and influences should co-operate. The universal solvent for the social and economic problems of the day is love and good will. The remedy for the present sad state of affairs must be a radical one. The only remedy for the inordinate lust of wealth, the transformation of men into mere 'hands,' the exploitation of the unskilled and ignorant by the selfish and designing, is first to seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. The worship of God alone can overthrow the worship of gold."

"Better than the dreams of the past, a necessity to interpret the realities of the present, is the vision of the City Beautiful that is to come, when men and women of every race worship God in the beauty of holiness; 'when there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free'; when each man is the equal and complement of every other man which the freest opportunity for self realization and self-expression, and with every possible inducement to do the right; when the boys and girls may play with perfect safety, if not in the streets at least in their playgrounds, and the aged may lean on their staves with the happy children gathered about them, as they say, like St. John in the marketplace, 'Little children, love one another'; when youth will have time to grow in grace and knowledge, and not be ground under the wheels of the modern Juggernaut before they have passed the storm and stress of early adolescence; when the strong men of action, the

'captains of industry' will bear each other's burdens and 'do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God'; when all employers and employed, rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, foreigner and native, male and female, shall be one, working with God and with one another. New men, inspired from on high will make new conditions. The confusion of tongues which pride and selfishness caused on the plains of Shinar is changed into harmony and peace at the Pentecost of love and good will in the Holy City."

The English Quarterlies contain much that bears on the great war. *The Hibbert Journal* (July) prints an article that was written during the Russian-Japanese War by the late Stopford A. Brooke. This article entitled "A Discourse on War," contains the following warning pertinent to the present situation:

Let England, let all the nations of the earth take warning! We are ourselves at the present moment in danger. In spite of all the efforts men of just and good will are making, the richer and more comfortable classes in this country, and their idle society, are becoming too fond of ill-got wealth, too luxurious, too reckless in wasteful expenditure, too idle, too immoral, too thoughtless of the duties of citizenship, too much like slaves of appetite, not to wake in the minds of the poor, the unemployed and the better class of workmen an indignation, wrath and sense of injustice which will not long be silent or inactive, and which, taken up by the scum of the towns, may breed violent riot, plunder and destruction. We are not so far from this as we imagine. Let Parliament look to this! Above all, let a rich and careless society mend its ways and learn its duties!

Of this terrible social and universal war, covetousness is also the root. This is as plain as the sun in the sky. If you want to lessen the pains of this war, to bring about a peace, to establish a juster, freer, nobler social state, purge, I repeat your own soul, set free your life from covetousness of every kind; and then you will be able by speech and action to unite yourself with all those who are striving to redeem society from the curse of this war,

and to establish, however far away, another social state in which war shall be no more. That is, and that is to be, the hope, the faith and the enthusiasm of the future world. Live in, and for, that hope, abide in the faith of it and let every act, thought and emotion of your life catch the fire of its enthusiasm. Then England may grow young again. New art, new literature, new politics, new business will be born, and science will no longer minister to the destruction but to the health and betterment of men.

Gettysburg, Pa.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

II. IN GERMAN. BY ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

For more than six months now it has been impossible to get any kind of religious or theological literature from Germany. Shipment of books and papers seems to be completely shut off by the blockade. It is very difficult therefore to learn much about the trend of thought and of events within Germany.

It may not be amiss, however, to discuss here some of the religious and ethical effects of the great war upon the German people as those effects were indicated in the literature that appeared during the early months of this year. For war is a great test of the religious and moral stamina of peoples just as personal suffering and grief is a test of the faith and the ethical strength of the individual.

Since the war with France in 1870 the German people have always had great confidence in their army. But the great question was concerning the spirit of the nation itself. The efficient organization of the military forces and the bravery of the troops were nowhere called into question. But what about the people themselves, the nation as a whole? Would the rank and file of the German nation in case of war manifest such qualities of character as would insure another splendid victory like that of Sedan, or would they manifest such a lack of will-power and such an incapacity for achievement as would lead to another inglorious surrender like that of Jena in 1806? This was the question before the present war broke out.

A careful examination of the signs of the times in Germany during the two decades or more preceding the outbreak of the great war would have revealed some symptoms of a moral decline on the part of the German people. The great increase in national wealth had the effect of softening and refining the modes of living and thus had produced in certain quarters a sort of hyperesthesia in

external life. Nothing really worth while had been accomplished either in art or on the stage. The field of literature seemed to be filled with amateurs and imitators. The mental sciences were being neglected while the physical and technical sciences were blossoming forth luxuriantly. Scepticism was rife. A onesided individualism was asserting itself. The masses hung slavishly and uncritically upon the assured "results of science." And finally, there was a ruinous spirit of partisanship and fratricidal controversy in religious affairs and in scientific circles as well as in politics. These are some of the characteristics of the times that a close observer might have remarked and they would have seemed to justify a certain degree of doubt concerning the essential vigor and the genuine powers of endurance on the part of the nation.

But now all such doubts have vanished. The German people has stood the test of war. They have stood the test, not as in 1806 when "for the sake of humanity" strong fortresses surrendered without firing a single shot of cannon, but as in 1870 when the whole nation from the Memel to Lake Constance, as Bismarck had predicted, burst forth like an exploding powder-magazine and furnished a most thrilling spectacle of patriotism, courage, and sacrifice. The gruelling experiences of the present war have once more tried the nerve and the sinew of the German nation. And now it is clear that their powers of achievement have not waned and their capacity for endurance has not vanished. The soft living that an observer with a false perspective might have regarded as a fundamental characteristic of the modern German nation, the aesthetic ideals, the irreligious views and the immoral practices, the winds of socialism and the hot fires of controversy, are seen now to have been only superficial and not of the essence of the modern German soul. They were but a thin veneer and had not touched the real heart of the people.

When war came superficialities fell away and realities stood forth. False ideals and perverse culture were scat-

tered to the winds. Aesthetics waned but ethics waxed. Scepticism and criticism no longer sufficed to meet the needs of the soul. The quality of faith which had been crowded into a corner came forth and entered into its own. An accentuated individualism vanished before the commands of the military chieftains. Lyric poetry was drowned out by the roll of the drum. The egoistic cultivation of "personality" disappeared as the educated and cultured joined the ranks with the raw sons of the peasants. It suddenly became a virtue to subject the will and to renounce individuality. The strong fiber and the stern stuff of the deep German soul asserted itself in its pristine tenacity and that too in a remarkably short lapse of time. All those unlovely qualities of personal and national character that had begun to manifest themselves during the last few decades are seen now to have remained upon the surface and not to have reached the real heart of the people.

Perhaps the future historian, who will be able to see things in their proper perspective and thus judge the years that preceded the outbreak of this war, will come to the conclusion that this awful conflagration arrived just at the right time to save Germany from a serious moral decline. A decade later might have been too late. False religions and soft morals might have eaten into the very vitals of the body politic. The philosophy of history will doubtless see a divine providence in the terrible baptism of blood through which the German people is now passing. But there can be no doubt that the nation is standing the test and is manifesting qualities of sacrifice and devotion almost inconceivable.

In his organ, *Die Reformation*, Professor Seeburg writes: "During the opening days of the war I visited a number of places in the German fatherland. The total impression that I received from my experiences in those days is unforgettable. Among old and young and in all classes of the people there was a deep seriousness and a grim determination that was most impressive. There were tears but there was no complaining. And how edifying it was to listen to the conversations of the youth!"

Everywhere it was the same tone: Our cause is just and God will help us; and again, The individual is nothing, the country is everything. It was not merely the educated classes who thus expressed themselves, but the same note rang out in the field and in the factory, in the store and on the street. The youth of the land hold the future in their hands and it was both a refreshing consolation and a glorious prophecy to witness the unanimity, imperishable and invincible, that prevailed among the younger generation in those serious days of testing.

"Older persons can easily fall into the error of complaining about the rising generation. But anyone who associated with the youth of our country during the opening days of the war must have felt his heart grow warm with gratitude and joy. Those were glorious days! Depths of soul were laid bare. Precious stones were quarried from the mines of emotion while unlovely pebbles disappeared from view. After all, there was a great deal of affectation in all this cringing attitude towards England and this fawning before the superhuman. But the style of yesterday has disappeared today, as a pimple disappears over night. The veil has fallen and we behold real men today in these youths who in clear and courageous words speak of the great tasks that lie just before them. There is no grandiloquence, no boasting. Sincerity prevails. German essence and Christian sentiments have once more made themselves supreme. Simple courage and deep piety are the order of the day, just as they were in the greatest periods of our history. The bloody work of war has led men back to the art of praying which many had forgotten in the quiet pursuits of peace."

Many thoughtful Germans have come to look upon this war as a divine dispensation to renew the youth of the nation. With all the terrible loss of life and the lurid destruction of property which the war has entailed, it nevertheless seems to have preserved the nation against the greater evils that inhere in the insidious influence of false ideals. The national decline which threatened the German people during the soft years of peace would have been far more direful both for individuals and for the

nation than any physical losses that have come during these iron years of war.

It is the world of ideas that in the long run controls the life of the nation and determines its fate. But the revolution which this great war has brought about through its readjustment of political power and through its changes in territorial bounds is very insignificant as compared with the revolution it has brought about in the world of ideas. Lines of thought which seemed to permeate the culture of the nation have suddenly lost their force. Views which had long since been set aside as obsolete and naive and therefore unworthy of "cultured personalities," have suddenly come to life and entered into their pristine vigor. For example, Doctor Kadner in his 1915 Yearbook for the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bavaria, presents a very readable article on "The Overthrow of Individualism." The same thought comes also from various other sources. Now the overthrow of that one-sided individualism which was beginning to characterize modern German thought before the outbreak of the war, is a fact whose consequences can scarcely be reckoned. It will have a deep influence on the thought-life of the future. It will make itself felt especially in the affairs of the Church and probably also in the theological sciences. The other sciences also, even the most remote and abstract sciences, have received new impulses and new objectives from the ethical revolution of the past two years.

The *Kölnische Zeitung* had an article some time ago on "War as a Teacher" in which it said: "All of us have unlearned our old lessons and have learned new ones. How thoroughly we have learned our new lessons need not be emphasized here. Deep in our hearts lives the holy consciousness that we belong together. We feel this so deeply that we cannot express it in words. Movement and vigor has come into our life again. Our millions of men have lived for months in constant readiness to die. They have been willing to dispense with all the refinements of civilization and even with the comforts of life. They have not hesitated to offer their goods and their

lives. And in all this they have been inspired by a common purpose and sustained by a common motive, a high sense of duty and devotion and an incomparable spirit of sacrifice. The effect of this upon the living can never be lost. What had once seemed of value, glitter and luxury and comfort, lost its attractiveness and became a matter of complete indifference. A whole people looked into the face of dire extremity, the danger of losing its country and forfeiting its independence as a nation, and determined to avert that calamity at any cost and under any sacrifice whatsoever. Immediately the supreme aim of the whole people and the impelling ideal of the individual underwent a profound change. Henceforth men were judged as men and as citizens according to the degree of their willingness to offer themselves up in behalf of the single purpose of the nation. This it is that indicates the greatness of the times and this is the one fundamental thought that has become the controlling factor in the life of the present day."

This remarkable change in ethical values was accompanied by a similar change in religious values. In the midst of war's confusion the Bible has been restored to its former dignity and has manifested its imperishable power. The Old Testament had seemed to the cultured mind of the modern world to have become thoroughly obsolete and was regarded merely as an interesting literary monument of primitive times. But now it has suddenly become new again and indeed quite modern. It seems as if the Psalms had been written for these very times. The ancient prophets appear again as keen observers of the times with expert knowledge of the human heart. The simple Gospel has been resurrected with all its treasures of strength and comfort. And the rich storehouse of thought in the apostolic letters is welcomed again by willing ears and longing hearts.

This does not mean that the German people has suddenly taken the old attitude towards God's Word which it held in Luther's day. That would be asserting far too much. It simply means that the old Bible has come again into a position of dignity and majesty commanding the

respect and reverence of men, reaching their hearts, filling them with courage, comforting them in pain and grief, and lifting them out of the depths. This is only a beginning and the fruit of all this is yet to grow.

It is as yet much too early to speak of a regeneration of the whole German nation. This entire revolution in the ethical sphere and this entire change of attitude on religious questions must be viewed in the light of the ancient saying of the philosopher Celsus, "Piety proceeds first of all from a feeling of awe." But from awe and reverence a bridge may easily be built to the genuine fear of God and filial piety towards Him. To build that bridge is the prime task before the Church of Germany today. The religious tide will ebb. It is to be hoped that the German Church will not be so unprepared and so helpless before her opportunities at the close of this war as she was at the close of the war of 1870. War in itself does not beget a new religious life: war only prepares the way for it. The religious resuscitation of the German people will not be a gift of the war; it will only be a possibility presented by the war, a problem to be solved during and after the war. And many and multiform are the suggestions that are now being made in various quarters for the religious restoration which is written so clearly on the docket of the German people.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE XI.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

A. J. HOLMAN CO. PHILADELPHIA.

Works of Martin Luther with Introduction and Notes.

Vol. I. Cloth. Gilt Top. Pp. 412. Crown 8vo.

Price per Vol. \$2.00 net. Vol. I and II are now on sale.

The present volumes are the first of a series of ten, which are made up of translations from the original Latin and German works of Luther. The Introduction informs us that the aim of the series is to furnish within the limits proposed "a selection of such treatises as are either of permanent value, or supply the best means for obtaining a true view of his many-sided literary influence." The late Dr. Spaeth was the Chairman of the Committee that organized the work. He has been ably succeeded by Dr. H. E. Jacobs. The other members of the Committee are Drs. Schmauk, Reed, Jacobs, Jr., Steimle, Steinhueser, and Revs. W. A. Lambert and J. J. Schindel. Upon the five last named the burden of preparing the translations and notes has rested. The translations of each treatise is preceded by a learned historical introduction giving the proper setting of the treatise. About fifty pages are devoted to these introductions in the first volume. Both the introductions and the treatises are enriched by copious foot-notes, which shed much light on the text.

The contents of the series embrace both some of the best known and some of the least known of Luther's writings. Of the fifteen treatises contained in the first two volumes ten have never been translated into English before. Moreover, these translations are not garbled or expurgated. They say in English what Luther said in German and Latin. The first volume presents treatises on Indulgences, Baptism, Confession, Consolation, Good Works, the New Testament, and the Papacy. The second volume contains the three celebrated productions: An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility, The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, and A Treatise on Christian Liberty. Beside these there are discussions on the Blessed Sacrament, the Ban, the first three parts of the Catechism, the Eight Wittenberg Sermons, and the Doctrines of Men.

Each volume has a complete index. The translations are idiomatic and clear, and while fairly literal they avoid Germanism.

These volumes make the immortal Luther stand out just as he was—human and fallible, yet courageous, far-seeing and generally correct in his judgments, the man of the centuries!

These volumes merit a wide circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

DOUBLEDAY, PAGE AND CO. GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

Sunday, The World's Rest Day. An illustrated story of the Fourteenth International Lord's Day Congress, held in Oakland, Cal., edited by a committee appointed by the Congress. Published for the N. Y. Sabbath Committee. Cloth. PPp. xiv. 622. Price \$1.50.

This volume contains the papers and addresses given at the Fourteenth International Lord's Day Congress at Oakland, California, 1915. These papers and addresses are the fruits of earnest thought, diligent research and varied experience. The authors are among the most eminent men and women of America and Europe. The various types of religious faith are represented—Hebrew, Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and the leading denominations of the Protestant Church. The writers are of twenty-five different occupations and spheres of life—actors, agriculturists, butchers, clergymen, economists, editors, educators, financiers, florists, journalists, laborers, lawyers, manufacturers, miners, missionaries, physicians, scientists ,socialists, soldiers, statesmen, trademen, traffic managers, railroad superintendents, ranchmen and theologians.

This is a very useful book, the minister will find in it many facts and arguments for interesting sermons on the vital question of a proper observance of the Lord's Day. The range of the discussions is wide, embracing the religious, social, legal and industrial aspects of the Sunday question. It seems at first somewhat strange that a Jew should be included among the contributors; and yet his point of view must be considered. He makes an earnest plea that the Jewish Sabbath be accorded the same rights in a free land as the Christian's Sunday.

The foes of Sunday Rest are considered by the writers of three papers to be the saloon, the excursion, and the Sunday newspaper. The "Civil Sabbath" is ably dis-

cussed by Dr. Josiah Strong. He argues from purely personal and patriotic grounds that laws restricting labor and pleasure on Sunday are not merely justifiable but actually necessary. He holds that Sunday rest is a physical necessity, and that it promotes financial prosperity! The State has an inherent right to prohibit certain amusements on Sunday if they be found injurious to the morals of the people. It is a fact that popular liberty is safeguarded by the religious observance of the Lord's Day.

Dr. G. U. Wenner of the Lutheran Church contributes a useful paper on "Holiday or Holy Day?" It contains a historical resume of the Sabbath and a plea for the maintenance of this divine institution on the part of Church and State.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

ASSOCIATION PRESS. NEW YORK.

Basic Ideas in Religion or Apologetic Theism. By Richard Wilde Micou, D.D., late Professor of Theology and Apologetics at the Theological Seminary in Virginia, and formerly at the Philadelphia Divinity School. Edited by Paul Micou, B.D., Secretary for Theological Seminaries of the International Committee Y. M. C. A. Cloth. Pp.xxii. 496. Price \$2.50.

Dr. Micou died of heart failure at the age of sixty-four at the zenith of his fine career as a theologian, and just as he was about to commit to permanent form the results of his long and accurate studies. He was fortunate, however, in having a son and pupil who found it a congenial task to gather from various sources the notes made by his father, and to combine them in the volume before us. The work of both is well done. The reader is grateful to the editor that matter of such superlative value in such excellent grouping has been preserved. One is drawn to Dr. Micou by his evident natural ability, erudition, discrimination, fairness and, above all, living faith. He analyzes all problems suggested by philosophy, science and history concerning the doctrines of God and Man, and finds no reason that would cause him to abandon the simple faith of the Christian. He holds that while it may be difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate in a purely logical way the existence of the Christian God, the devout student is confirmed in his intuitive convictions and Bib-

lical faith by the contemplation of the facts and the arguments furnished by observation and deduction.

The method of treatment is at once clear and profound, enriched by the gleanings of wide reading, especially in philosophy. The thetical affirmations are sustained by clear reasoning and the untenability of the anti-thetical arguments is exposed.

The Idea of God is studied along four lines—Observation furnishing “The Witness of History,” Reasoning, “The Witness of the Intellect,” Aesthetics, “The Witness of the Beautiful and the Sublime,” and Intuition, “The Witness of the Spirit.” The first point deals with the theories of the origin of religion. The second sets forth the old philosophical arguments, the Cosmological, and the Teleological, and also the Anthropological argument. This last argument presents matters pertaining to human personality, freedom and conscience. The third general argument is built upon the presence of the beautiful in nature, which must indicate a beauty loving Personality back of it. The fourth—the argument from Intuition—emphasizes the universal, ineradicable conviction that there is a God. There is an instinctive faith in the human soul that reaches out after God. No contrary reasoning can eliminate it. This intuition is the basis of the Ontological argument, which comes down from the ancient philosophers but which received its logical phrasing from Anselm. A note in the Appendix is quite illuminating concerning the attitude of Anselm, who has been misunderstood and even derided. “Anselm’s postulate is that God exists so truly that He cannot be thought not to exist. He quoted the verse in the Psalms, ‘The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God’ to show that only a fool could make such a statement, for either he does not know the real meaning of the word, ‘God,’ in which case he is foolish to say anything at all, or he does know its meaning, and in that case he is logically a fool, for he affirms a contradiction in terms, since ‘God’ means the universal ground of being, and the fool’s remark would, therefore, be ‘Existence does not exist.’” Confronted with the objection that things could be imagined to be more beautiful than they actually are and that imagination cannot impart beauty or existence, his reply was that his argument applied to only one idea, which we call God. Anselm was right. He believed that a universal and necessary intuition must have its objective counterpart. His appeal was to those who had faith and his argument was intended to be a confirmation of it. And this it certainly is. The Cosmological

argument is the application of the axiom that every effect must have a cause anterior and exterior to itself. This simple intuitive conviction is as old as the race, and appeals with force to the great mass of mankind. Back of the universe with its marvelous adaptations must stand an absolute Creator.

In connection with the Teleological argument, Dr. Micou discusses at some length and with much thoroughness the question of Evolution, which he defines as "a revelation of God's method of creation in the organic world by continuous and progressive modifications from within, instead of by discontinuous and instantaneous fiats from without, its analogy being organic growth, not mechanical action. The whole process reveals an immanent teleology guiding and determining the end from the beginning."

While gratefully receiving the facts discovered by Darwin he shows the utter fallacy of much of his reasoning, especially the unwarranted introduction of chance as a principal factor in the development of the universe. Darwin, he says, "is guilty of what might be termed a new logical fallacy, the fallacy of the imperceptible. He seems to think that if a thing grows slowly by minute gradations it needs no explanation, the process is its own cause. But no modification, however gradual, can begin a new line of growth, nor create even in germ that into which it is to develop. The smallest germ of an eye, a tiny nerve surface sensitive to light, is a new thing in nature when it first appears, and the environment could never produce it. It is from the first a potential eye, and all after developments simply carry on to perfect form the possibilities latent in that sensitive film."

The author discards the mechanical theory of evolution. He holds that back of the laws of nature is the Divine Energy, "guiding and overruling the whole process of continuous creation by definite modifications through immanent directive and formative forces which work in harmony with the environment and gradually embody the type of species in final form."

The Second Part of the volume contains a presentation of "The Spiritual Idea of Man," showing him to possess an immortal soul. History testifies to a universal belief in man's immortality and conscience affirms it. Life in its earthly aspects is felt to be incomplete, demanding an endless future for its satisfaction. There can be no communion with God unless man knows himself to be immortal. In illustration of this truth the author devotes

a chapter to quotations from the poets—Shakespeare, Milton, Cowper, Shelley, Wordsworth, Arnold, Tennyson, Browning and others.

In the whole discussion Dr. Micou is especially strong in his defense of the truth against the perversions of false philosophy.

We heartily commend the volume to the thoughtful.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings with the assistance of Drs. John A. Selbie and Louis H. Gray. Volume viii. Life and Death—Mulla. Cloth. 8 x 11. Pp. xx. 910. Price \$7.00 per volume.

The evident purpose of this great Encyclopaedia to present facts in an undogmatic way is realized in the volume before us. The reader may draw his own conclusions. The first article treats of Life and Death in the comprehensive manner which characterizes this work, covering forty-six large pages. The biological aspects of the subject are ably presented by Prof. J. A. Thompson of Aberdeen University. He acknowledges that life in its essence is not known to the biologist, but he is sure that neither Bio-chemistry nor Bio-physics can explain it. The origin and nature of life find an adequate explanation in the Bible alone. The new world-view and the extraordinary discoveries of science do but establish the truth that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

The article on Lourdes, written by a Catholic is a defense of what the Protestant claims to be gross imposture, made somewhat plausible by the alleged experiences of neurotic persons. Most marvelous cures of every nature are reported to have taken place at Lourdes through the intervention of the Holy Virgin. The author with apparent frankness affirms that these cures are utterly inexplicable from the standpoint of medicine or human therapeutics. He denies that they have any affinity with the cures of Christian Science and many other faith-healing organizations. He asserts that the fullest medical investigation is welcomed.

Dr. H. E. Jacobs has furnished the articles on Luther and Lutheranism, giving the gist of the Reformer's life and of the principles of the movement which bears his name. While very brief, these articles are discriminating and comprehensive.

The ancient theological discussions are treated with fairness under such headings as Macedonianism, Monarchianism, and Monotheism. Fifty pages are devoted to Missions,—Buddhist, Christian, Mohammedan and Zoroastrian. Articles on the Messiah, Methodism, the Moravians, Modernism, and Monasticism are full of interest. A Miracle is defined by Dr. MacCulloch "as an occasional evidence of direct divine power in an action striking and unusual, yet by its beneficence pointing to the goodness of God." Miracles are presented as reasonable and necessary in the divine government.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

MARSHALL JONES CO. BOSTON.

The Mythology of All Races in Thirteen Volumes, Louis Herbert Gray, A.M., Ph.D., Editor. George Foot Moore, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor.

Greek and Roman. By William Sherwood Fox, A.M., Ph.D., Asst. Professor of Classics in Princeton University. Volume I. Size 6½ x 9½ inches. Pp. lxii. 354. Cloth. Illustrated.

North America. By Hartley Burr Alexander, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy in the University of Nebraska. Volume X. Pp. xxiv. 325. Cloth. Illustrated.

The two superb volumes before us are the first of a monumental work to be completed in thirteen volumes. The thoroughness which characterizes the enterprise of publishing a universal mythology is indicated not only by the names of the learned contributors but also by the fact that five years of contract work have been expended on it and seventy-five thousand dollars invested. Various illustrations, including many colored plates, adorn the volumes. The paper and press work are very fine. The work of the respective authors is done with much care.

No such comprehensive work as this has ever before been attempted. It, therefore, occupies a unique place among books. While most thorough and learned the *Mythology of All Races* appeals to any intelligent reader. It is not intended for specialists particularly, but for all who are interested in mankind.

Mythology makes a large contribution to every department of life. The History of Religion cannot be written without a knowledge of it. Science appears in it as understood by primitive people. Their daily life—personal,

domestic, social and political is reflected in it. The symbolism, which appears in its stories and carvings, gives an insight into the profound ideas which were and are cherished by many races. The wisdom of the ancient philosophers, who knew how to interpret nature and the human heart, gleams in the suggestive myths and tales of gods and men.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

SHERMAN, FRENCH AND CO. BOSTON.

Religious Rheumatism. By J. B. Baker. 8 x 5½ inches. Cloth. Pages 220. Price \$1.35.

This volume takes its title from the first chapter, which is much the longest in the book, covering twenty-five pages. All the other chapters are quite brief, not more than eight or ten pages, and are prefaced with texts. They have evidently been used as sermons, at least in substance.

There are sixteen chapters in all, with such topics as "Our Besieging Enemies," "The Icy Hand of God," "A Sprig of Evergreen," "How He Sends Us," "Little Samuel's Coat," "The Hopeless Quest," "The Stick and the Axe," "Finishing the Unfinished," &c.

The very titles of these papers suggest what may be expected in them, and the reader is not disappointed. Sometimes titles are very misleading. Before the days of pure food laws, the label on a package, or can, or bottle, furnished but little guaranty as to its contents. Goods that were advertised as "absolutely pure" were not always found to be so by the buyer. This is sometimes the case even now in spite of all the pure food laws both State and National. It is often so with sermons and addresses, and even with books. It is not always safe to believe everything that the publishers say about the books they offer for sale, and many a congregation has gone to hear a sermon on a bright and attractive theme announced in the papers or on a bulletin board only to listen to a dry, dull discourse droned out without life or interest, a trial to the mind and a weariness to the flesh.

It is not so with the chapters in this book. They are all as original, and fresh, and interesting as the titles themselves. They fairly bubble over with life and inspiration. Sometimes the exegesis may be somewhat strained, sometimes there is a tendency to allegorizing that reminds one of Origen and his school, the rules of Homiletics may be ignored or cast to the winds, there may

be an occasional slip in the rhetoric, but these faults are easily forgiven when the reader is kept wide awake and his interest is caught and held by every sentence, every illustration, every figure of speech, every striking turn of the thought, and he feels all the while that he is being fed on the bread of life, and given to drink of the water of life.

Mr. Baker is always fresh, always original, always interesting. He has the happy faculty of expressing his thought in a bright and telling way. He is always "just a little different," to use a current advertising phrase. Those who have heard him know that this is characteristic of his sermons and addresses. Those who hear him may not always agree with him but they will not go to sleep. The remarkable thing is that these qualities of compelling interest carry over so well into the printed page, and are just as marked a feature in reading after him as in hearing him speak.

All through this volume there is a great wealth of illustrations, historical, classical, mythological, scientific, biographical, narrative, personal and imaginative. Metaphors and similes sparkle everywhere like the dew drops on the grass in the morning sun. Mr. Baker seems to think in pictures, and always to have at hand just the right figure of speech with which to flash the picture from his own mind to the minds of his readers or hearers. This makes live preaching and live writing, and is well worthy of being studied by other preachers and writers, especially those who are just beginning their work.

An extract or two, we are sure, will be appreciated. Take this from the chapter on "A Sprig of Evergreen" based on Col. 1:5, "The hope which is laid up for you in heaven:" "One of the saddest moments for an American tourist going to Europe alone is the moment the ship glides into the port on the other side and receives the salutations of the eager, anxious faces and hands awaiting there. The sadness comes not from the sight of land, for all the tourists are glad for that, nor at the sight of the happy reunions, but from the thought that in all that multitude of waving hands and kerchiefs there is none for him. He is sailing from the charted sea of water into an unknown sea of laughing faces that care as little for him as the foaming billows for the keel.

"But the sadness incident to landing on the other side of the Atlantic will not be felt when he lands on the tropical shore of heaven. When the ship that carries us up from this little world of ours glides into the placid harbor of heaven, there'll be some waiting for us there. I

sometimes think the splendor of our western sky is but the mingled radiance of our loved ones' faces looking eastward. The sun, it seems to me, could not throw such glory there."

We take another selection from the chapter on "Why We Love the Church." "Those who have suffered that we might worship would make the grandest procession that this earth ever witnessed. It would stretch around the world, traverse every country on the globe, go through caves and catacombs, enliven the forests and dazzle the cities. The solid earth alone could not contain it. The Atlantic would have to help, for the heartaches of the Mayflower and the Welcome and the Santa Maria are among the most precious records of heaven; the Pacific would have to help, for it alone could repeat the sufferings of the hundreds who have gone to its many isles; the South Seas would have to give space for Gardner and Calvert and Paton and the thousands of others who struggled and prayed with them; the procession would wind around Cape Horn, it would zigzag its way through the icebergs of Alaska, it would necklace the Alps, it would move through Africa from Cairo to the Cape; but with all its magnitude and with all its splendor it would be like a cathedral without a dome until the Hero of Palm Sunday rode at its head. His sufferings and His death inspired all others and in the all-inclusive capacity of His deity exceeded them in intensity and extent. He above all paid the price not only of our redemption but of our Church. Therefore we love it. It cost all that heaven had. Its price is above the price of rubies, hence it is more to be desired than silver and gold."

The publishers have done their part well in issuing this volume. It is printed in clear type, on a fine quality of paper, and with wide margins that make it a pleasure to the eye of the reader. It is also well bound. We have observed some carelessness in proof reading, as "Sara Maria" for "Santa Maria," the name of Columbus' flag ship, and Paton for Paton the missionary to the New Hebrides, &c. Fortunately there are not many as glaring as these.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Eisenach Gospel Selections, Made Ready for Pulpit Work. By R. C. H. Lenski. Second Edition carefully Revised, Two Volumes bound in one. 8vo. Half Morocco binding. Pages IX + 1149. Price \$3.50 net.

It is about five years since Professor Lenski issued the first edition of this valuable work. The fact that a second edition has been made necessary in so short a time, gives evidence both of the growing popularity of the Eisenach Gospel and Epistle Selections among Lutheran pastors, and also of the high appreciation of Professor Lenski's expositions. A similar volume on the Eisenach Epistle Selections has been issued by Professor Lenski in the meantime, which has also had a ready sale.

There has long been more or less dissatisfaction with the old Gospel and Epistle Pericopes because of their fragmentary character and their lack of consecutiveness. As is well known, this grows out of the fact that originally there were two additional pericopes for each week for use on Wednesdays and Fridays. When these were included, there was of course a very much fuller and correspondingly more complete presentation both of the life and sayings of our Lord as found in the Gospels, and also of the teachings of the apostles as they are recorded in the Acts and Epistles. The connection between the successive lessons was then also much closer, and much more evident. But the dropping out of the two weekday lessons, and the retention only of the lessons for Sundays, has necessarily broken this connection and gives the impression of fragmentariness for the series as a whole.

The avoidance of this, and a better order of succession and a closer connection, are among the advantages of the Eisebach Selections, which are among the best, and seem to be the most widely used, of the more recent series that have been arranged from time to time. It does seem as though the time ought to be near when Lutherans could get together in some general council, or conference, and agree on a new system of pericopes which would be more satisfactory than the old historic one, and which would be generally recognized and used.

One of the striking and very commendable features of Professor Lenski's work, as presented in these volumes is the prefacing of the comments on each cycle of texts with a chapter on the Cycle itself, in which he sets forth the central thought, or theme, of that Cycle and then points out clearly the relation of each successive lesson in the

Cycle to this central theme. In this way the logical connection of the texts in each Cycle, and also the logical progress of thought in the whole series, is beautifully exhibited. This cannot fail to be a great help both in preaching on the series and also in the use of them for private reading and meditation.

Instead of the customary division of the first, or festival, half of the Church Year into the Christmas, the Easter and the Pentecost Cycles, Professor Lenski prefers to recognize five cycles; Christmas, Epiphany, Lenten, Easter, and Pentecost. The reasons which he gives for this seem to be entirely satisfactory. The central theme of all these Cycles taken together is stated as "The Great Deeds of God for Our Salvation," and then the central theme of each of the five Cycles given falls in under this, and there is a beautiful and logical progress of development from the birth of Jesus at Christmas to His ascension and the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

The Trinity Cycle covers the last half of the Church Year, and includes the Sundays from the Sunday after Trinity to the Sunday preceding Advent. The central theme of this Cycle is "The Great Kingdom of God on Earth," but it includes five sub-Cycles each with its own appropriate central thought growing out of the general theme: viz., (1) "The Sinner and the Kingdom." (2) "The Life in the Kingdom." (3) "The Characteristics of the Kingdom." (4) "The Requirements of the Kingdom." (5) "The Consummation of the Kingdom."

But the chief value of these volumes is found in the work which Professor Lenski has done in the exposition of these lessons. The sub-title, "Made Ready for Pulpit Work," might prove misleading to some. It might suggest a series of sermons all ready for use. But this is not what we find. If it were, it might prove to be a very doubtful good to many pastors. What we do find is a series of exegetical and expository notes, quite full and very suggestive, and marked by ample scholarship and a deeply evangelical spirit. From ten to twenty pages are devoted to these notes on each lesson. These are usually followed by a page or two of "Homiletical Hints." These consist of suggestive seed-thoughts, illustrative matter, pertinent quotations, etc. Following these is a series of sermon outlines, some of them original with the author, some of them gathered from others. Of these the author says, they are "meant to be suggestive and stimulating, and not for sluggards to appropriate mechanically."

This last sentence of the author's might well be applied to the entire volume. No doubt a "sluggard" could me-

chanically appropriate a good deal of the rich material here furnished, and unfortunately there are such sluggards in the ministry of all the churches. But it is plainly manifest all through that such was not the author's intention. He has simply sought to furnish the raw material which the earnest and faithful pastor can use in that careful, and thoughtful, and prayerful preparation which should always be made for the preaching of the Gospel. Used as thus intended the volume must prove most helpful.

Before closing we must add a word of praise for the publishers. We have never seen a finer specimen of the art of book-making. The paper, the type, the proof reading, and the binding, are all of the highest class and all that could possibly be expected in a book of this size and price. Indeed it is hard to see how such a book can be sold for the price named in view of the increased cost of materials and of labor. It is a credit not only to the Lutheran Book Concern of Columbus but also to the entire Lutheran Church.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

BOOKLETS.

Some Counterfeit Religions. An Investigation of the Falsehoods and Reversions taught by the Sects and Isms. By F. C. Longaker, Ph.D., Professor in Lenoir College, Hickory, N. C. Published by the Lutheran Board of Publication, Columbia, S. C. Paper. Pp. 38.

The subjects treated are Spiritism, Russellism, Eddyism, Mormonism, and Socialism. The booklet is a convenient, brief and fair summary of these strange forms of belief among us. It ought to have a wide circulation.

Historical Lutheranism. By Mrs. Harriet Earhart Monroe. Tenth revised edition. Paper. Pp. 28. Price 5 cents a copy, 40 cents a dozen or \$3.00 a hundred. Published by The Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

A new edition of Mrs. Monroe's little catechism in one-hundred questions and answers is timely on the eve of the 400th Anniversary of the Reformation. In brief compass the booklet covers all important phases of the Lutheran Church. Every Lutheran in the land should have a copy, and some additional copies to give away.

A Fourfold Test of Mormonism. Failure of Pro Mormon Apology to Impair the Test. By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. Paper. Pp. 40. Price 10 cents a copy. Published by The Abingdon Press, N. Y.

This pamphlet is a supplement to Dr. Sheldon's recent book which bears the same title and should be secured by the owners of the book. The booklet is an answer to the attempt of Robt. C. Webb to refute Dr. Sheldon's treatise. All decent people who know anything of Mormonism know that it is a fraud, and no effort of men like Webb can make them think otherwise. Dr. Sheldon, in his usual calm judicial manner, vindicates his former treatise.

Christ's Humiliation. By Rev. D. Simon, A.M., Dillsboro, Indiana. Paper. Pp. 11. Price 5 cents per copy, 50 cents per dozen, and \$3.00 per hundred. To be had from the author. Published by the Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

This is a devout thetical treatment of the person and work of Christ in His state of humiliation.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.

BASED ON ORIGINAL SOURCES

Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters

Translated and Edited by Preserved Smith, Ph. D.

What a wonderful privilege it is to read the private letters of Martin Luther and the active men of Reformation days. These faithful reflections of their innermost lives show their secret feelings, loves, hates, hopes, suspicions, confidences and comments. There is hardly a better way to obtain a clear insight into the causes and effects of the Reformation—it is history at first-hand.

It is also intensely human and with biographical notes and other necessary annotations, sheds much light on this period of Luther's early spiritual struggle, 1507-1521, the time covered by Volume I. Two more volumes are in preparation.

What Non-Lutherans Have Said About It

"It was a happy thought that suggested the publishing of these letters and the great usefulness of the book is evident and will be appreciated by all those who wish to find the inner sources of the Reformation."—Boston Transcript.

"Such books as this should be in the library of every minister and layman interested in the Reformation period."—Reformed Messenger.

"We doubt if there is another American scholar so well fitted to perform the task as Dr. Smith."—The Advance.

"A treasure-house of the sixteenth century originals more than usually accessible and of great value."—English Historical Review, London.

"This is a valuable source-book of the history of the great revolutionary movement of which Luther was the protagonist."—The Outlook.

Isn't it just the book your library needs—just the information and inspiration you need?

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY
1424 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA.

BB Em

PS:

51

